Vol. XVIII.] . . . 2.

Pacific Theo Sem Jan 11

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

APRIL, 1911.

An Estimate of the New Thought: I. Exposition. HORATIO W. DRESSER 161
The Psychology of Health. THOMAS FRENCH, JR. 180
Means of Promoting the Inner Life. JOHN T. PRINCE 192
Religion and Formal Worship. E. M. L. GOULD 204
Truths Needed by the World. WALTER A. ROBINSON 214
Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. JAMES REED 220
The Word in Hebrew and Its Translation. JOHN WHITEHEAD . 230
Are There Imperfections in Swedenborg's Scripture Interpretations? JOHN F. POTTS 243
Swedenborg and the Drama. CHARLES W. HARVEY 259

Editorial Department: 273
Easter and the Lord's Body; The New Thought; Present Tendencies of Religious Thought.

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies: 289
The Lord's Prayer: Mr. Cabell's Suggestion Regarding Its Translation; On the Translation of John iv, 24: "God Is a Spirit"; The Appearances of the Lord after His Resurrection.

Current Literature: 305
Transactions of the International Swedenborg Congress; Worcester's, Sewall's, Bogg's, and Claxton's biographies of Swedenborg; Odhner's Correspondences of Canaan; Lodge's Reason and Belief; Fagan's The Cheapening of Religion; Kelly's Twentieth Century Socialism; White's The Old Order Changeth.

BOSTON:

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION,

16 ARLINGTON STREET.

50 CENTS A COPY. (ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas.) $2.00 A YEAR

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW.

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is the lineal descendant of the *New-Jerusalem Magazine*, which was established as a monthly periodical in 1827. In 1893 it was believed that a quarterly review of the progress of the church and the world, allowing for longer articles and a more comprehensive treatment of subjects, would be of greater service. The form was therefore changed and a characteristic title adopted. The field to be covered has been the same for this long period now approaching a century, but greatly changed and ever changing more swiftly. The light in which it is viewed is from the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, unfolding as they do the spiritual meaning of the Holy Scriptures and fulfilling the prophecy of the Lord's second coming to save mankind.

The REVIEW is seeking to set forth these principles, which are represented in the closing chapters of the Word by the symbolic New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven to a new earth (REV. xxi, 1, 2). It is endeavoring to show their application not only to the organized New Church but also to the world in this period of transition and upheaval that is ushering in a "new era" of thought and life. In this effort it has been supported by able writers both in this country and abroad; and with such success as to call forth warm commendations. A prominent minister, experienced as an editor of another periodical of our faith, has just written, "I wish you every success in the publication of the REVIEW, which is a splendid representative of the church." A layman in the great city of the West, renewing his subscription for 1910, adds: —

"I desire to record my profound satisfaction with the REVIEW. I read every issue from cover to cover. . . . I feel like blessing the Lord that He has raised up a corps of writers who can so learnedly and lucidly treat of the deeper things belonging to His New Church."

The Board of Editors, as now organized, consists of the Rev. H. Clinton Hay as managing editor, and of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite; with the Rev. James Reed in an advisory capacity.

Entering upon its eighteenth year the REVIEW asks for the continued and increased support of those whom it serves.

$2.00 A YEAR. SINGLE NUMBERS 50 CENTS.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union, 16 Arlington Street, Boston.

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XVIII.] APRIL, 1911. [No. 2.

AN ESTIMATE OF THE NEW THOUGHT.

I. EXPOSITION.

IN undertaking to evaluate a practical tendency of thought still influential in our time, it is well to remind ourselves that precise conceptions have little sway over mankind; hence we must be on our guard lest we import alien standards into a region of emotion, fancy and impulse. As students of science we deplore this fact; for we prefer to begin with well ascertained facts, and proceed with sure inductions. Yet as lovers of our kind we must know what actuates the children of the age better than they know it, constructively pointing the way to the land of clear vision. Hence it is incumbent upon us, while cherishing high standards, to maintain that ready sympathy which grows out of genuine knowledge of human nature. If we expect a great deal, if exacting, we shall defeat our ends. If willing to follow gleams of light amidst darkness, a reward will surely be ours. The master of science is the man who is able to detect a measure of truth amidst a great admixture of error, and connect this truth with the system in which it is fulfilled.

The New Thought is not a product of scholarship, and it cannot be defined with precision. It has no central organization, or authoritative leaders. Its devotees have made little effort to state its scope and content; and when they meet in a

national convention, their statements are decidedly general. The New Thought is simply a name for a practical tendency, a phase of the mental-healing movement. Our best course is to regard it as we would any of the tendencies of the age whose outcome is not yet clear. Its correctives must also be found in the age itself. If we find serious fault with it, let it be in the name of an epoch which esteems mere experience and practicality.

In the field of thought we are about to enter, it is Christian Science which has compelled the critics to give heed; and it is the Emmanuel movement which has thus far provided the best substitute for unscientific mental healing. Yet with these two movements we are to have nothing to do. Christian Science is an authoritative collection of beliefs dependent on acceptance of a single leader, a definitive text-book, and an organization which rigidly excludes the unfaithful. The Emmanuel movement is no less precise in its insistence on principles; howbeit these are wide as the poles asunder from Christian Science, and in explicit accord with scientific psychology, medical science, and the established teachings of the church. The New Thought is a free movement represented by a collection of therapeutists, teachers and writers. Consequently we must approach our subject in an empirical spirit, undertaking to discover the general practical tendency, and the prevailing doctrine. That is, the New Thought is heterodox, and represents a reaction against Christian Science in favor of the rights of each individual to obtain for himself the privileges which make the so-called science rigidly exclusive. Many followers of the New Thought have been influenced by Christian Science, yet have thrown aside their allegiance and branched out freely for themselves.

The mind-cure movement was already old, when the term "New Thought" was first applied to it. It began in the United States with the investigations of Mr. P. P. Quimby, of Belfast, Maine, more than seventy years ago. Christian Science, taking the form of an extreme reaction against the materialism of the

nineteenth century, represented a radical interpretation of the original mind-cure theory and practice. Mr. Quimby's teaching lived on, and still thrives in a quiet way. Various terms, such as "mental science" and "metaphysical healing," were employed from time to time by way of contrast to, and in protest against, Christian Science. The term "New Thought" came into vogue in 1895 as a name for this rationalistic therapeutism. It renounces the so-called pope of the mental-healing world, discards personal authority, and maintains the right of every man to become a mental therapeutist. The difficulties of our subject are therefore those of any movement when it reaches the sectarian stage and is divided into small groups.

The old thought against which the new reacts is that of bondage to authority, whether ecclesiastical or medical. The reaction was not a moderate one, but, like so many of which history has record, was emphatic and complete. Most partisans of the new cult gave up organized religion and medical science altogether. Some have since undertaken to found new churches of their own; others have ventured without any scientific training to treat disease in all its forms. As irrational as this procedure may appear, our part is to take this movement as we find it. It would be far easier to condemn this wholesale reaction than to estimate the therapeutic work actually accomplished. If we are to avoid judging by alien standards, we must endeavor to appreciate this reaction against theology and medicine from the inside, that is, in the light of therapeutic experience. This undertaking will depend upon our ability to follow the general line of thought known as "new." For although the doctrine grew out of the mental cures, and never would have come into existence without these, we are most likely to understand this interest in the cures by considering the doctrine.

The New Thought claims to reveal life as a whole in a new light; that is, from the point of view of mental influences, states of consciousness and subconsciousness, social atmospheres, inner attitudes, expectations, and beliefs. To gain this new

consciousness it is expected that you will close your eyes so far as your former world of thought is concerned, cease to think of yourself as a physical organism with a soul, a creature of natural circumstances, subject to diseases and evils of physical origin, and begin to regard yourself as a soul or spiritual being, using the body as an instrument, enjoying conditions which correspond to interior needs and states of development. This world is not a hostile field in which warring forces prey upon the soul. There is no evil as a reality in itself, no disease as a mere entity. God made us good, and meant us to be healthy. Our fears and anxieties, our pessimisms and troublesome conditions in general, are of our own making through ignorance and a wrong attitude towards life. The trouble is not with the world, not in external conditions, but in ourselves. Therefore each should look to himself. The true philosophy of life is an abounding optimism, free, practical, inspiring an attitude which invites conditions of health, happiness, prosperity. He who understands how he created his misery and disease, should be able to heal himself by turning to the sources of life and power. Hence the first consideration is the changed point of view which gives this line of thought its character; the next is the practical method in which emphasis is placed on silence, affirmation, realization, the therapeutic practice of the presence of God.

In order rightly to appreciate the New Thought, we must put ourselves in the attitude of one who believes he has full right to turn directly to the highest spiritual sources, who acknowledges no authority save that of his own experiences, leadings and thoughts, and who finds in "ideal suggestion" a panacea for human ills. This attitude by no means implies lawless self-assertion, but the belief that man has long lived under authority in ignorance of his divine birthright. The universe is unquestionably a place of law and order; but for each it is what his consciousness makes it. To know life as it is, one must seek the sources of power for oneself, become one's own minister and physician. The discovery of the inner point of view implies an awakening to consciousness of higher powers

which may be put to practical use. Hence the evidences in favor of the New Thought are not primarily of an argumentative, but of an empirical character. To know that the new consciousness is efficient, you must test it by actual experience, undertaking to verify the truths which others have proved through practice. That is, you must observe regular times for meditation, make optimistic affirmations, hold the best thoughts about yourself, practice the silent or mental treatment which constitutes the heart of the New-Thought method.

As far then as it is possible to define the New Thought, one understands by the term an essentially empirical or practical line of teaching involving certain beliefs about life and health, and leading to a workable consciousness whose efficiency is ascertainable through individual experience, meditation, and mental treatment. The New Thought, unlike Christian Science, is not a body of doctrine which you are invited to accept before you receive treatment, but a collection of beliefs with a prevailing tendency, subject to the modifications which each individual is likely to introduce, — an art rather than a science. Hence individual differences are welcomed. The beliefs which give content to the general tendency, have grown out of successful experience, have been made to cover the whole of life because they are believed to bring desired results.

In order to put oneself in the devotees' place and learn why the New Thought is so highly esteemed, one must bear in mind the need which prompted the pioneers in this field. Mr. Quimby, the first of these leaders, believed himself incurably diseased; hence he discarded medical science as a failure. In this condition, ready for anything new, he began experiments in mental phenomena which led him to believe that people are often profoundly mistaken with reference to their illnesses. One may accept a physician's diagnosis and apparently have the disease thereby described, when one is really a victim of inner disturbance or conflict which might be overcome through genuine knowledge. His own case proved to be of this description; for a young man in a hypnotized condition gave a clair-

voyant account of his state which differed radically from the physician's diagnosis. This gave him a new clue, and he regained his health by taking as his starting-point the inner condition, conscious and unconscious, instead of the external or bodily symptoms. Seated receptively by the sick, he found that he too could diagnose the interior condition, discover the fears, disturbing emotions, haunting mental pictures, false beliefs, and the like; that is, he discerned the heart of the patient's trouble. He therefore ceased to experiment with hypnotism, and began to depend upon higher resources. Furthermore, he discovered that by concentrating on ideals of health and happiness, he could arouse a new process within the subconsciousness of the patient. This process established ideal imagery in place of the beliefs which the patient had accepted in regard to his disease. This method grew under Mr. Quimby's hands, and became an established mode of treatment. This method underlies the entire mental-healing movement. All the pioneers were Quimby's patients, who went to him after the physicians had done their utmost. They accepted the new ideas for the simple reason that these were offered in explanation of the cures. Experience, not theory, was the decisive factor. The reaction against the church and against medical science resulted because the new method brought results, whereas the old had failed. A new connection between the teachings of the church and therapeutic principles was established because Quimby believed he had rediscovered Jesus's method of healing. Furthermore, religious excitement proved to be a potent cause of disease, as understood by Mr. Quimby; and in place of Calvinism, Quimby promulgated a practical conception of the divine immanence which his patients eagerly accepted. Profoundly impressed by the fact of their restoration to health under what they took to be spiritual auspices, it is not strange that Quimby's patients found in his teachings a substitute for former beliefs and modes of worship. They did not discard the Bible; but instead of the ecclesiastical forms, adopted the new practice of silent realization. Taking their

clues from Quimby, each began to investigate for himself. This explains the widespread diversity of views in the mental-healing world.

The central principle is found in Quimby's conclusion that "whatever we believe, we create;" that if we accept a diagnosis, an opinion, or creed as true, it is true for us. Quimby held that instead of sounding matters to the foundation, the majority of men judge by appearances, and credulously enter into ill-founded beliefs. Thus men accept the verdicts of physicians about their health, the opinions of priests about their souls, and are subject to enslaving social atmospheres. If we knew ourselves, if we did not rest content until we should possess truth, we could take our troubles to the supreme source and receive help from the divine wisdom. Quimby undertook to bring his patients to judgment, show them their bondage, put them on their feet in all respects. He cared nothing for the external symptoms of disease, but sought the inmost conditions. His treatment, partly silent, partly conversational, was intended, as he said, to "disabuse the mind of its errors" and establish the truth in their place. "The truth," he maintained, "is the cure." By this he meant the inner or spiritual truth, the wisdom of man's real situation in life. He did not claim this wisdom as his own, but was a firm believer in direct, divine guidance. He took no credit to himself for his cures, but held that the divine wisdom working through him accomplished the results. It is well to bear all this in mind, since as we shall see, the later devotees have not always been true to the essentially spiritual principle on which Quimby insisted.

The main point to notice at present is the emphasis which Quimby put upon opinion, or thought, and on the divine wisdom in contrast with the divine will; for this explains a great deal in the later history of the movement. Out of this essentially intellectual emphasis has come the New-Thought doctrine of to-day, namely, the theory that thought is central in human nature, formative, creative, the greatest power in the wo ld. Quimby is not responsible for the sweeping generalizations

afterwards made, nor did he formulate the general principle that "all causation is mental." These generalizations are due to Mr. Henry Wood and other New-Thought leaders, who have given shape to the mind-cure movement since 1890.

Quimby held that the mind of man is plastic, impressionable, like a fertile soil. This amenability to suggestion is particularly true of our subconscious mental life — the twilight region of our consciousness into which notions, fancies, and fears enter with great ease. At the point where this mental twilight is lost in the darkness that envelops our physical processes and hides them from our sight, the mind is most susceptible. Here is where the greatest mischief is played. But here, too, is the responsive region which is made most of by the spiritual therapeutist. For our subconsciousness must be changed before the body will respond, and before the conscious self knows that the therapeutic process has actually begun. In this twilight region we are open to the illuminating presence of God. What we need is the light of the divine idea which shall disperse the darkness of error. A receptive patient is particularly open to such illumination. The therapeutist is the friendly lamp-bearer who guides the way through the dark journeyings of the soul.

See why an idea strikes home and produces subconscious results, and you have the whole process in outline. For example, if some one makes a remark to me which gives rise to an initiatory emotion of anger on my part, and if hateful thoughts are thereby suggested so that I give way to the emotion and let it grow, it is plain that to harbor the thought of hate is to find myself the victim of consequences which come as matters of course. The anger forthwith gains control, the blood rushes to my head, my cheeks become hot, I clinch my fists, and strike a blow. The results that later ensue — the headache, the remorse because of my indiscretion, the general nervous disturbance — are not the real trouble, but its effects. The cause was the thought of anger, hatred, animosity. The thought grew upon me because I accepted it, permitted it to draw its

like and increase. What I had power to control was my thought. Lacking in inner control, or failing to exercise my powers, my wrong thought developed into a harmful direction of mind.

Likewise all troubles are said to grow because at the critical juncture we accept opinions, enter into errors, harbor unfortunate thoughts. The wrong direction of mind gives shape to subconsciousness, and the involuntary organism accomplishes the rest. Likewise, too, the cure is first a thought, a sentiment of peace, forgiveness, or love. When I turn from hatred to love, from excitement to peace, my general consciousness responds, the excitement subsides, a subconscious change ensues, and the organism does its part correspondingly. Everybody knows he has power to change from a thought of hatred to one of love. We all know more or less about the consequences of jealousy, worry, nervous wear and tear, emotional excitement of all sorts. We know, too, that our lusts and appetites eat into our substance. We are aware that the general mode of life has much to do with the diseases which grow out of our conduct. Make the most of this, learn much more in the same direction, and you will have the beginnings of the mental-healing theory. Go further still, trace these disturbing emotions and thoughts to selfishness, and your doctrine will become spiritual. You will then see that you must have a way to touch the hearts of the people in order to be a genuinely spiritual healer. Thus the therapeutic practice gradually passes over into the field of the church.

Mental treatment is devised to reach the subconscious states of which the patient is ignorant. In nearly every case the therapeutist finds that fear and nervousness have been important factors. Naturally he makes great use of affirmations that tend to soothe the mind and allay fear. If the treatment removes the nervous tension and quiets the nervous activity, the psychophysical responses will accomplish the rest. The central point is an elevating thought, a word of peace or faith which gives definiteness to the spiritual realization; as you might say emphatically to yourself, "Be still," when tempted to yield to

anger. The reiteration of the decisive word is necessary in order to make the requisite impression. Thus the New-Thought method of "entering the silence" by employing idealistic affirmations has had a natural history. This method is now employed for general purposes in place of prayer, because it was found efficient in treating the sick. The affirmations are of an ideal character, because the effort is to establish trust in the place of fear, love instead of hate. The central thought is believed to be formative, because through subconsciousness it draws corresponding conditions. The affirmation, impressed upon subconsciousness, establishes a new centre of equilibrium, precisely as the sentiment of peace drives out the thought of anger. The conditions of receptivity and expectant attention are necessary in order that the desired impression may be made.

This principle will become clearer if we note that it is not the one on which the ancient Hebrews placed stress. The Hebrews were impressed by the consciousness of sin, the alienation from Jehovah through wrong acts of will. Regeneration was to come about, so far as human initiative could secure it, through obedience, through readjustment of the will. According to the New Thought the trouble with mankind is not primarily sin or evil; hence the resource is not found in moral regeneration of the will. The trouble is said to lie in human ignorance, error; the will is seldom mentioned. Man is ignorant of the truth that he is a spiritual being having power over his organism in health and disease. He unwittingly associates harmful ideas with sensations and inner states of various sorts, and thereby creates his misery. He falls into numberless misconceptions in regard to his situation in life, hence becomes a victim of his own opinions. By long association he has connected various aches and pains with certain names, so that whenever he feels the pain he assumes that he has caught the disease signified by the name. In the same way he has associated certain effects with liquids and powders, until these, used as medicines, actually produce the results which the habitual thought of the race has associated with them. Many other substances besides poisons

have likewise acquired apparent qualities of their own. Freedom from all these unfortunate associations comes through the discovery that wrong thought is the potent factor. The same power that has brought us our misery will bring us happiness and health when new thoughts establish new associations. It is the truth which sets men free. Consequently, the prime requisite is not a doctrine of sin, a scheme of salvation, a plan for the training of the will; it is knowledge of the types of consciousness which create misery and suffering, and of the sorts of affirmation which dispel wrong beliefs, banish fears and other disturbing emotions.

This point of view is so unusual that we must approach it in a number of ways to make sure that we understand it. Ordinarily, one distinguishes between man's active powers and his thoughts. Psychologically speaking, thought is not creative in a volitional or physiological sense, but its function is to imitate or represent; while the will makes the decisions and acts upon the acceptable idea. Consequently, we would maintain that one might hold good thoughts for ever, and make little headway, since a thought or mental image is not ordinarily supposed to have formative power. But in the New Thought no such distinction is made. Thought is regarded as practically synonymous with action. What we believe we act upon. What we believe or think at heart, what we hold in mind, forthwith gives form to our inmost attitude, so that we attract corresponding conditions. A man's physical condition corresponds to his prevailing thoughts. If you see him bowed down and limping with rheumatism, you may know that he has held angry, contracting, selfish thoughts. If poor, miserably placed in life, you may infer that he is lacking in confidence, a victim of fear and mental weakness. To cure him you must bring him into a state of buoyant belief in himself in which he holds up his head in confidence. Carry this process far enough, and it will be found to cover the whole of life. It will not then be necessary to speak of sin or evil; freedom comes through right thinking, the decisive power is in our hands.

An illustration will make this point clear. If you and I should enter a forest at night, we might readily create in imagination many a fearful shape out of harmless stumps and rocks. If we were denizens of a superstitious age, these figments of the imagination would become realities for us, and we should dwell in a world of our own fancy. The resource in such a case would be to examine each of the dark objects around us in the forest, discover the actual facts, and thereby disabuse the mind of its errors. We should then judge, not by the appearance, but by what we knew to be the truth concerning the rocks and trees. In a similar way we might examine our beliefs, distinguishing between the experiences we actually feel and the emotions or ideas associated with them. Thus we might examine and understand all things in life, if we possessed the right clue. Life for most of us is an ill-defined wandering amidst circumstances which we do not understand. Born in ignorance, we mistake our bodies for ourselves, and enter into bondages without limit, deeming ourselves creatures of mere things, climate, weather. If we knew our true estate, we should know that as sons of God we are gifted with superior powers which we seldom use. Our struggles and woes are explicable by the fact that, like men in a forest mistaking stumps for wild beasts, we make of life what we put into it, and become victims of our fears. If you are in an ill-natured, disconsolate frame of mind, your world will correspond. If happy, optimistic, ready to make the utmost of every opportunity, you will find the world like your prevailing state of mind. The trouble is not in the world; it is in you. Mend your mood, and you shall mend your world.

The real trouble is never physical, and cannot be cured by physical means. The physiological conditions really exist, to be sure; and when a man believes he has a headache or the rheumatism, he really has it. But the external appearances are like the imaginary forms seen in the darksome forest. The physician has made a mistake in diagnosing the bodily symptoms, noting the temperature, inquiring about the sleep or the digestion. All causes are mental; and to know why a man has

the heart-disease or rheumatism, you must know what sort of consciousness he has put into his life; you must examine his beliefs and fears.

Take a more specific instance. A man feels a slightly painful sensation about the heart; and having heard of heart-disease, readily concludes that he is already a victim. To attach a name to a sensation is to add to its power; and the name "heart-disease" is especially potent. Stirred by increasing fears, this man hurriedly consults some one, describes his pain, and is assured that he really has the dreaded disease. This verdict adds to the power of the idea, and the man's mind now becomes completely filled with the wrong consciousness which the idea generates. The idea takes hold of the man's subconsciousness, affects the nervous system, throws the organism more out of adjustment, and gradually creates conditions corresponding to it, until the man really has heart-disease, and is likely to be seized by the arch-fear, death.

Now, if instead of being treated as a physician would treat his case, he is put under the care of a mental therapeutist, the procedure would be somewhat as follows. The therapeutist is supposed to be one who sees not only the illusions of the stumps and the rocks, but the real rocks and trees in the forest. In this case the rocks and trees represent the man's spiritual welfare as God conceivably regards it. That is, God meant us to be well, and we always are well in reality. Sickness, Mr. Quimby declared, is an error or "invention of man," due to misinterpretation of aches and pains. If the man in question had turned in consciousness to God, when he felt the first tinge of pain, affirming and realizing his oneness with God, the pain would have passed, and a normal state of consciousness would have driven out the fear. The disease was created by wrong thought out of a sensation which was misunderstood. The man is still ignorant of all this, hence must be helped by the mental therapeutist until he can realize the renewing presence of God. God beholds him in his integrity as His child, free, sound, sane. The therapeutist's part is to establish in the

man's consciousness this divine image, so that the man may be freed from his error, and restored to his true estate.

In our supposed forest, you might discover ahead of me that the bear we were afraid of was only a stump. If I doubted, you would bid me draw near and look, assuring me that there was nothing to fear. Finally you would lead me up to the stump to prove that you were right. What you would be telling me all along about the stump would correspond to the realization or affirmation of the healer who aims to banish from the man's mind the notion that he has heart-disease. That is, the healer, sitting in silence by the patient, would put his mind through a process somewhat as follows, addressing his thought to the patient's inmost self. "Peace be with you. I come as a messenger of peace to bring freedom and happiness. Let us realize the peace and goodness of God. You are God's child, perfect in ideal, strong, well, and free. In God there is perfect peace and harmony, no discord at all. Let your fears and doubts go, that you may know His peace and love. There is nothing to fear. Now your fears are going, you are becoming restful, trustful and free. You are settling down, down into quietness and repose; the disturbance is subsiding; the tension is lessening. Now God's perfect ideal is being realized. You are at peace; you are well; you are healed." This general realization, reiterated and made emphatic, would be followed by a more specific series of affirmations with reference to the particular need of the patient; and the disturbed region would be pictured in ideal terms in accordance with the standard of perfect health. This realization would be said to take effect in the organism of the patient through impressions produced on his subconsciousness. These impressions would, in turn, be regarded as producible because of the intimate relationship established between one mind and the other through receptivity and coöperative response, through mutual relationship with the divine presence. The silent realization would not, strictly speaking, be the same as a prayer; for God would not be asked to do anything. The assumption would be, that

whatever is needed by this patient, he already in deepest reality possesses; he is healed now; in spirit he is at peace, already God's child, sound and sane in the divine image. The realization is intended to bring this truth into actuality, thereby dispersing the shadows, and clearing away the errors. Whatever wisdom or power may be required to accomplish this result is at hand, and need not be asked for in prayer; the healer's part is to enter into the divine life already at hand, and become an agent for it. The essence of this method lies in the fact that the treatment or realization is a concrete way of making spiritual truth real and vivid. Devotees of it sincerely believe that they have found a way to make Christianity practical. They do not claim that their fundamental principles are new. The novelty or originality is said to lie in the method.

Thus we see why the mental therapeutist follows an inner clue, virtually ignoring the traditional conceptions of disease and its cure. The inner clue is followed in accordance with the healer's intuitive diagnosis. It implies the conviction that life is really an affair of consciousness, a series of spiritual states, while our physical experience is an expression of these states. For example, Henry Wood, one of the leading New-Thought writers, says, "The body is a grand composite photograph of previous thinking and mental states. . . . Man's physical organism, like that of all animate creatures, is built *by* its invisible resident, and not for him. Life expresses itself through matter, but this process is never reversed. . . . The physical organism of man manifests his own erroneous and false thinking of the past, and also, in some degree, that of the race in general." (Ideal Suggestion, pp. 34, 80, 100.)

From this point of view, we are like men and women witnessing a play dealing with the issues of modern life. Each of us maintains a certain conviction, or prevailing attitude. We get out of the play what we carry to it, permitting ourselves to be disturbed, or remaining outside of the excitement, according to the consciousness we bring. If we change our consciousness, we change the play. Life is indeed no play; it is real and earn-

est, but it was meant to be joyous and healthful. There are resources enough for us all. Every man was meant to stand upright and enjoy his own. The divine opulence is for all. It is the soul that makes circumstance, not circumstance that shapes the soul. To succeed you must first of all believe in success. Assume a manly attitude, and you will find the world coming round to your position; new opportunities will reveal themselves, and everybody will help you to your goal.

Thus it comes about that great emphasis is put upon inner quietude, poise, receptivity, since these states attract the most desirable conditions. Thus the New-Thought people affirm that they already are what they will to be; they already possess what they need. Their part is to be open, and responsive. By the same principle, one may "realize" for another in all the conditions of life, sending out good and loving thoughts. Nay further, our whole consciousness in daily life should conform to the ideals of "the silence." We should think no ill, feel no resentment, enmity or dislike; we should carry atmospheres of peace, love, and charity wherever we go, thinking the best about everybody, looking for the good in people, calling it forth, holding fast to it.

Spiritually interpreted, this teaching means that man is directly open to the wisdom and power of God. The affirmation "God is here," is a favorite among New-Thought people. To affirm that God is vitally present, is to put the mind into an attitude to ascend to a higher level of consciousness. The power thus apprehended is the real therapeutic agency. It is this power that enters the soul of the healer and is thence transmitted to the subconsciousness of the patient, or directly received by the patient if open to it. Hence the healer does not claim to influence the patient's mind as in the case of hypnotism, but to be a channel of communication for spiritual power.

As an agent of divine power, one who is able to heal through right affirmation, the healer believes he is able to turn to God without mediator. That is, Christ for the New Thought is not a person, but a universal spiritual possibility — the "Christ

within" of every man who claims his oneness with God; while the man Jesus was the prophet of this consciousness. The conception of God is scarcely personal, but verges on spiritual pantheism of a Hindoo type. God is universal life; nothing stands between us and the greatest wisdom... In fact man himself is divine. There is a sense in which the most radical devotees of this belief hold that you are God, I am God. The individualistic optimism of this cult knows no bounds.

Constant use is made of the Scriptures, for in them the best affirmations are found. But the implied assumption is, that each man can go directly to the sources of spiritual power. What Jesus did as a prophet or forerunner you and I could do if we could as fully realize our oneness with God. He showed his consciousness by his works of healing. The church has lost sight of this the most practical phase of the Christian life. In our time the therapeutic power has been rediscovered and put within the reach of all.

Thus the best that can be said of the New Thought is, that it has revived the old-time practice of the presence of God. Unlike the mystics who in pious seclusion meditated on the divine presence, these modern devotees of silence gather in groups or in twos, and meditate for practical purposes, holding that the healing of disease is the test of the reality of spiritual realization. Nor are they believers in mortification of the flesh or in ascetic training. They take the world as they find it, and are practical children of a practical age.

Lest one think that this method cheapens the thought of the presence of God, it should be stated that human nature is still the same the world over. The New Thought neither makes nor mars its followers. These carry into their world whatever is in them; the best adopt the new belief reverently, the others make much or little of it according to their type. The pioneers were more earnest and consecrated than most of the later followers. When the doctrine became popular, there were people who saw in it a means to private ends; and they took full advantage of their opportunities. The first devotees

never spoke or thought of themselves as divine; nor did they refer to Jesus in an offhand way, as if any man by taking thought could become a Christ. I am undertaking to state the average or representative doctrine. In this doctrine the central interest is always individualistic, affirmative thought.

It is not necessary to inquire into the reasons for this change, for that would involve a history of the subject. Suffice it, that in place of Quimby's modest claims in his own behalf, his conviction that the divine wisdom was the real efficiency in the therapeutic practice, others have put the statement that "thought heals," and have taken a goodly measure of credit to themselves as healers. Where Quimby emphasized concrete understanding, others have placed stress on abstract affirmation. Whereas he sought to bring his patients to judgment that they might know where they actually stood, others have affirmed their ideal perfection as true now. Quimby's procedure would lead to the adoption of a theory of gradual growth into fuller adjustment with spiritual realities, while the later theory has felt the influence of Christian Science, and has made little or nothing of the principle of evolution. Quimby's more rational view has been lost in the interest in individualistic affirmation fostered by people of a less earnest type. It is primarily the differences in temperament which account for these variations. Granted the belief that each man may go to the supreme sources of wisdom and power, you would naturally expect that each would put his interpretation upon the resulting experience; for there is no standard in a doctrine in which the first principle is individual fidelity to direct guidance. In a large-minded reverent person this fidelity becomes a form of worship, leads to self-effacement and sacrifice; in a self-seeking person it becomes a new form of aggrandisement. It is the self-assertive person who makes a stir in the world; hence the doctrine is judged by his conduct. Fortunate it is for the onlooker, if he seek far enough to discern the real incentives without which the movement of thought in question would never have come into being.

The merely mental doctrine of to-day by no means accounts for the mind-cure movement and its persistent life despite all criticism. Evidently the movement has a message for our time. Hence the emphasis in the foregoing exposition on the essentially empirical character of this line of thought. To know the inmost spirit of the movement, you must always suppose yourself in the position of one who is dissatisfied with medical practice and with the churches, and who sets out on an independent quest for health, happiness, and spiritual food. The investigator finds satisfaction and peace not primarily because he accepts a new teaching, but because in the therapeutic realization of the presence of God, he finds a ready resource in times of trouble. The doctrine grows out of the experience, not the experience out of the doctrine. Quarrel with the interpretation if you will, but make sure that you see the force of the experience.

HORATIO W. DRESSER.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HEALTH.

Amid the turmoil and seething that attend this period of transition from the old to the new era, a period in which all things are beginning to be made new, no subject has attracted wider attention than that of health and disease. Schools and cults of diverse kinds are endeavoring to blaze the way to universal health. We hear of cures by faith and cures by mental treatment; of magnetic healers and metaphysicians, all claiming marvelous results. In Christian Science we behold a therapeutic cult numbering its votaries by tens of thousands; and lately, the Emmanuel Church in Boston, and similar centers elsewhere, are directly connecting the Christian Church with the problems of health and disease, in the effort to regain and exercise some of the healing power of the early Apostolic church. Not a few members of the New Church have been drawn from their moorings and carried away by these currents; and we are thus brought face to face with the questions: What is the truth of the matter? And what should be our personal attitude toward it?

The subject is exceedingly complex and does not admit of adequate treatment in brief compass. The consideration of its basic principles in bare outline is all the writer will now attempt. So vast is the theme that it embraces mankind in its entirety; man as to his soul, man as to his mind, man as to his body, man as to his environment natural and spiritual, man in relation to God and to man, — in a word, man as to his entire constitution and eternal destiny. Remembering that the Divine Providence always regards what is eternal in its dealings with man, let us approach the subject of health and disease from the viewpoint of the eternal.

When we speak of health, we must think not only of bodily health, but also of mental health; when we speak of sickness, we must think not only of bodily sickness, but also of mental

sickness; when we speak of healing, we must think not only of bodily healing, but also of the healing of the mind; when we speak of a man, we must think not only of his body but also of his soul.

Every child born into this world is created that he may become a perfect part of a perfect whole, and by his growing perfection add to the perfection of the growing whole. The heavens form such a perfect and growing whole, the Grand Man. "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one."

The word 'Health' implies wholeness and soundness; the word 'Disease' implies brokenness and unsoundness. A bell that is whole rings true; a bell that is cracked rings false, for it has lost the secret of harmony. Human wholeness implies wholeness of the entire man as to body and mind. Health that is worthy of the name means a sound mind in a sound body. Unless both body and mind are well, neither can be well, for a sick mind begets a sick body, and a sick body begets a sick mind. The sympathetic interaction of mind and body is a matter of common experience; yet to a certain extent both mind and body possess distinct and independent powers of recuperation in obedience to a principle to be noted later.

All disease is disorder, and disorder is the result of the infraction of law. The restoration of order is attainable only by conformity to law; and the maintenance of order can be secured only by constant obedience to law. No mental action and no use of drugs can maintain in health the body of a man who is constantly transgressing the laws of physical health. The first essential is knowledge of the law, and the second is rigid obedience to it. Bodily disease may often be traced to the wilful or unwilful transgression of law. The wilful transgression of spiritual law is sin, and in sin Swedenborg finds the primal origin of all diseases, spiritual and natural. The origin of disease being thus in the mind, it is reasonable to seek in the mind a cure for disease. When the cause is removed the effect ceases.

There can be no true science of mind-healing apart from a true science of the mind and of the nature of the communication between the mind and the body. Says Swedenborg, "The human mind is a spiritual man; and is also actually a man. Hence it is that the spirit of man, which is his mind in the body, is in all form a man." The subject of mind-healing begins at once to assume a different aspect when we think of the mind as a man; not merely as part of a man, but as a complete man, having in its structure all the parts and organs of a man. Again our author says: —

It is believed at this day that the mind is in the head, and nothing of it in the body; yet both soul and mind are in both the head and body, for the soul and the mind are the man, for both contsitute the spirit which lives after death.

All things of the mind correspond to all things of the body, and therefore also the mind actuates the body in externals; it actuates the eye to see, the ear to hear, etc. The mind not only actuates the externals to these things, but also the internals in the whole series; from the inmosts the ultimates, and from the ultimates the inmosts.

The mind through a continual influx builds the body to activities concordant and synchronous with itself; and therefore the bodies of men, regarded interiorly, are nothing but forms of their minds organized to effect the behests of the soul.

Swedenborg's analysis and luminous exposition of the several distinct regions of the mind, far transcends anything that has come to light in these days concerning the so-called subconscious mind and the results expected from its cultivation. A few summary statements and citations will serve to indicate the nature and great value of our author's contributions to the psychology of health: —

Man has two minds, a natural mind and a spiritual mind. Both of these minds are to be opened and cultivated by suitable means. The natural mind is opened and cultivated by such things as are in the world and the spiritual mind through such things as are in heaven.

Man is born from his parents an image of the world, and is born anew that he may be an image of heaven. Man is an image of the world as to his natural mind, and he is an image of heaven as to his spiritual mind.

The natural mind which is the world is below; and the spiritual mind which is heaven is above. The natural mind is full of evils of every kind, as thefts, adulteries, murders, false witnesses, lusts; nay, blasphemies and profanations of God. These evils and many others reside in the natural mind, for the loves of them are there, and the derivative delights of thinking, willing and doing them. These things are innate in that mind from the parents; for man is born and grows up in the things of that mind, being restrained only by the bonds of civil right and by the bonds of moral life, from doing them.

Before regeneration every man is a kingdom divided against itself. His natural mind is divided against his spiritual mind. His natural mind is unsound, it is sick, it is afflicted with diverse spiritual diseases; for the lusts and passions of the lower mind are nothing but spiritual diseases. Says Swedenborg, If these diseases, including envy, hatred, revenge and impurity, are not cured, they destroy a man's interiors. When these are destroyed, the exteriors suffer, and draw him into disease, and thereby into death. Again he says: —

Evil closes the smallest and quite invisible vessels of which the next greater ones are composed; for the smallest and quite invisible vessels are continued from man's interiors; hence the first and inmost obstruction, and hence the first and inmost vitiation of the blood; — this vitiation when it increases causes disease and at last death. But if man had lived the life of good, his interiors would be open into heaven, and through heaven to the Lord, — thus also the smallest and invisible vessels. Hence man would be without disease and would only decrease to old age, and when the body could no longer minister to its internal man or spirit, he would pass without disease out of his earthly body into a body such as the angels have.

That this would be the normal and orderly manner of passing away from earth, is apparent from what is related of the inhabitants of Jupiter who do not call this transition dying, but being heaven-made. "Such among them as have lived in true marriage love and have taken care of their children as becomes parents, do not die of diseases, but in tranquillity, as in sleep; and thus they migrate from the world to heaven."

Again we read:—

All evils and falses both engendered and acquired, have their seat in the natural mind. Evils and falses reside in the natural mind because that mind is in form or image a world; while the spiritual mind is in its form or image a heaven, and in heaven evil cannot be entertained. The spiritual mind therefore is not opened at birth, but is only in the capability of being opened. Moreover, the natural mind derives its form in part from substances of the natural world; but the spiritual mind from substances of the spiritual world only; and this mind is preserved in its integrity by the Lord, in order that man may be capable of becoming a man; for man is born an animal, but he becomes a man. The natural mind with all its belongings is coiled into gyres from right to left, but the spiritual mind into gyres from left to right; the two thus curving in directions contrary to each other, a proof that evil resides in the natural mind, and that of itself it acts against the spiritual mind. Moreover the gyration from right to left is turned downward, thus toward hell, but the gyration from left to right is turned upward, thus toward heaven. This was made evident to me by the fact that an evil spirit can gyrate his body only from right to left, not from left to right. Gyration follows the flow of the interiors, which belong to the mind.

Disheartening at first as is the discovery that our lower mind, the mind of our conscious life and worldly activity, is a potential hell, being gifted with a vortex motion downward toward hell, the situation is mightily relieved by the assurance that within and above the natural mind is a spiritual mind which is a veritable kingdom of heaven within us; and that this higher mind is ever preserved in its integrity by the Lord, to the end that man, born an animal, may become a man.

At birth the spiritual mind is closed, but it is capable of being opened; and the way by which man is to be transformed from an animal into a man, is through the opening of the spiritual mind. So long as the windows of heaven, opening upward into the higher mind, are closed, so long man remains an animal; so long the spiritual disorders of malice and greed hold sway in the realm of his conscious life. Plain and unmistakable is the instruction given as to how the spiritual mind is to be opened; it is by the shunning of evils as sins, by the help of the Lord. In this and no other way can the spiritual mind be opened; and

by means of such opening the natural mind is cured of its diseases and brought into a form correspondent to the spiritual mind. The downward vortex motion is thereby not only stayed; it is reversed and brought into spiral harmony with the music of the higher spheres, and while this marvelous change is going on in the region of the lower mind, a mighty influence is extending further downwards and making itself felt throughout the physical body. This brings us to the region of our aches and pains, which we are inclined to think of exclusively when we speak of disease and its cure.

How wonderful the human body, the outward derivative and covering of the mind and spirit! By means of its five senses, its five gateways opening outwards, the body enables the mind to sound the depths and shallows of the material world, and to do its work therein; and at the same time it supplies the mind with an instrument whereby it may expel all uncleanness and false ideals, whereby it may eat of the hidden manna and become flooded with the light of life. If the spiritual mind be opened, the light of heaven descends and stops not until it has accomplished that whereunto it is sent in the whole mind and in the whole body. "The light of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If, then, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness." If the spiritual mind be closed, the natural mind is also closed above, and the malignity of evil is increased accordingly. A man whose spiritual mind is shut, and whose natural mind is thence also closed above, lives immersed in the debasement of the bodily senses; he is afflicted with a deadly spiritual malady; he is stretched upon a death bed and must perish unless he becomes healed.

But is such a man also afflicted with corresponding bodily disease? Not necessarily; on the contrary, he may be exulting in the possession of exceptional physical health. Strange incongruity this. On the one hand we see degenerate, brutish men, strong and well in body, and handsome in form and

feature; on the other hand, we see spiritually minded people, seemingly open to all good influences, and yet suffering from a multiplicity of bodily ills. The inference is plain that one's spiritual state cannot be determined from a diagnosis of one's physical condition.

We are not left hopelessly at sea, however, in face of this enigma. A clear explanation of it follows from our doctrine of influx. The inflow of life from the Lord is both direct and indirect. This inflow is always according to recipient forms, and modified according to changing conditions. The inflow of life into the mind and body of an angel of the highest heaven, — one who has attained unto the full measure of a man, — is very different from the inflow into the mind and body of an unregenerate man. In the former all the planes of his mind are open to the Lord and to heaven; life descends from center to circumference according to the law of correspondence, and this angel man is one harmonious whole; his body is the perfect similitude and effigy of his mind, of which it is the ultimate expression. The well mind thus begets a well body, and maintains the body in perfect health. In the man, however, whose spiritual mind is closed, a well body cannot be thus attained and maintained. The channels provided for the orderly descent and appropriation of life in successive planes are clogged and distorted. The chambers of the natural mind are filled with uncleanness, and from it health and strength and beauty cannot be derived into the natural body. To meet this condition, the Lord in his mercy has provided that life shall flow into the externals of man's body directly from the heavens and from Himself, thus by a general influx, as is the case with other animals, instead of through attendant spirits. This saves man from external bodily obsession, and enables him to be gifted with external health of body, and even with external beauty of person, while his mind is beset with spiritual disease and open to assault by evil spirits. Be it well noted, however, that this applies only to the exteriors and to the grosser elements of the body, and not to the inmost vital fluids and smallest vessels; for in a

brutish person these are always vitiated and defiled as has been previously shown.

In this connection it is well to remember the important teaching that "All Divine influx is from first things into last things, and through a connection with last things into intermediates, and thus the Lord binds together all things of creation; and for this reason He is called the First and the Last." To follow up this lack of complete correspondence between the health of one's soul and the health of one's body would lead us too far afield, as it includes the entire subject of influx direct and indirect, also the influence of environment spiritual and natural.

The companions we keep have much to do with the tone of our moral life, and we little appreciate the influence exerted by our unseen associates on the tone of our inner life. We have the choosing of our companions, visible and invisible. Whatever our inheritance of mind or body, we have in our hands the control of our distinctive developments in the lines of health or disease. It is helpful to know that the inner springs of the bodily life can only be rendered clean and healthful by the reordering of the lower mind, and the bringing of it into subjective harmony with the higher mind which is fed from the pure fountain of life and health. We have seen that the tiger of the jungle, having no spiritual mind, is supplied with health of the tiger quality by general influx; also that the human beast of the jungle, having no effective spiritual mind, is measurably supplied with physical health by similar means. The recognition of this principle, however, does not contravene that other great principle whereby the Lord, acting from the center into the circumference, is ever acting thence according to man's coöperation upon all intermediates, in the effort to coördinate in him all powers of mind and body, and thus cast out all manner of disease.

At the time of the first advent, when the Word become flesh and dwelt among us in the person of the Lord, He manifested the Divine Power of the Word in the healing of all manner of diseases. The centurian said unto him, "Speak the word only

and my servant shall be healed." Again, "When the even was come they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils, and He cast out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick."

When, in the fullness of time, the Lord disappeared from earthly view, he gave to his disciples power to do likewise in His name, that is, in the power of the incarnate Word. These miracles of healing were all signs and portents of a deeper and fuller healing to follow. "Their restoring the infirm by laying on of hands," says Swedenborg, "signified that by communication and conjunction with heaven, thus with the Lord, they should restore to health from spiritual diseases which are iniquities and sins." The Lord couples diseases with iniquities and sins by reason of the correspondence existing between them. This relation of correspondence is a causal relation. To the sick man at the pool of Bethesda He said: "Behold thou art made whole, sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee."

We are now witnessing the dawn of the Lord's second coming in the healing power and great glory of His Word. Again He is healing all manner of diseases as a sign and portent of the fuller and deeper healing which shall attest the final establishment of the New Jerusalem on the earth. In the saner ideas as to religion and life, — in the emphasis now laid on human service rather than on effete and decadent doctrines, — in the yearning after universal brotherhood among men, — in the quickened public conscience and in the higher standards of morality set for men in public and private life, we recognize the amelioration of mental diseases through the power of the truth; and finally, in the many modern schools of bodily healing with their partial glimpses of truth, mingled though they be with errant philosophies, we recognize a movement in preparation for the making of all things new through the power of the living Word.

Meanwhile it behooves all to exercise a wise circumspection lest they be beguiled by the teachings of those who claim to be apostles, but are not. Although false Christs arise and threaten

to deceive the very elect, let not those whose minds are opening to the rational light of the new dispensation be led astray. Let them not make affirmations of untruths and cajole themselves into the delusion that they are truths; let them reject and strenuously oppose the employment of hypnotism in any form as subversive of mental freedom which is indispensable to the work of regeneration; and let them turn for instruction to the writings of the church and to the opened Word. In the Word of God, as now opened in the power of the Spirit through the pen of Emanuel Swedenborg, is contained the power to heal all manner of diseases, natural and spiritual.

It is not the will of God that any one should be sick in mind or in body. This is evident from the law of the Divine Providence which makes health a condition necessary to the work of reformation. In the work on "Divine Providence" we read: —

> No one is reformed in unhealthy mental states because they take away rationality, and consequently the freedom necessary to act according to reason. For the mind may be sick and unsound; and while a sound mind is rational, a sick mind is not. . . . No one is reformed in a state of bodily disease, because the reason is not then in a free state; for the state of the mind depends upon the state of the body. When the body is sick the mind also is, because of its separation from the world, if for no other reason.

Accordingly, under the Divine Providence, it is the duty of everyone to seek to be well in mind and body. To this end the Divine Providence concurs in the use of all means contributory to health; it concurs with the use of remedies wisely administered; it concurs with mental and spiritual aids based on a true understanding of the Word of God in combination with ways of wholesome living, including due attention to food, water, air, exercise and sleep.

To pass from a state of disorder into a state of order, from a state of disease into a state of ease, in which one is free to employ all his faculties of mind and body in useful work, but two things are needful as to both mind and body. These two things are assimilation and elimination. Both mind and body must be furnished with wholesome nourishment in sufficient

quantity, and this must be digested and assimilated; both mind and body must cast out impurities and decaying matter, which breed putrefaction and death when retained in the system. If the kidneys and other excretory organs do not properly perform their functions, the body becomes afflicted with uric acid poisoning, and with diverse malignant growths. If the mind is not set free from corresponding impurities of thought and desire, it becomes a prey to spiritual disease and death.

The body is always being re-made after some plan; it is being torn down and rebuilt by the processes of assimilation and elimination. The moulds into which newly assimilated materials fall in the body are called cells, and the moulds into which newly assimilated nourishment falls in the mind are called thoughts; but thoughts are cells of the organic substances of the mind, and bodily cells are thoughts in lower derived forms. The innermost cells of a man's body are determined in character, as we have seen, by the quality of his thoughts. Thoughts are the derivative forms of the affections of the life's love. Thoughts that are impure and false cannot serve as moulds for the inbuilding of pure life substance; for the rebuilding of a sick body into a well body. As a man thinketh, so is he. In so far as the body is recast into sound and true thought-moulds, it will cast out disease and take on health. This is the process of Divine Healing to which the teachings of the New Church point the way. They point the way to self-help by exposing one's infirmities to the health-giving rays of the spiritual sun, and by holding in mind an idea of the perfect health in which the spiritual mind is preserved. They point the way to mutual help through the power of uplifted and directed thought.

For perfect illustration and exemplification of the principle underlying this process we must look to the transformation which is described as taking place in the spiritual body after death. The main difference lies not in the principle of action, but in the greater plasticity and responsiveness to mental action of the substances of the spiritual body.

Our earthly bodies are cast in moulds supplied first by our earthly parents; but after death, the body in which we awake is torn down and rebuilt after the pattern drawn in our book of life. The interiors of the mind then take on outward expression in the form and features of the body; the mind actually transforms the body into a perfect effigy of itself. The body thus becomes healthful, strong, and beautiful, in the case of all who have eaten of the tree of life; and diseased, weak and unsightly, in the case of all who have eaten of the tree of death. "The leaves of the tree shall be for the healing of the nations." The leaves of the tree of life are living thoughts, leading to a life of active uses in manifestation of love to God and man.

References to Citations and Summaries:—"Divine Providence," n. 124; "Conjugial Love," n. 260; "Divine Providence," n. 181; "Divine Love and Wisdom," nn. 269, 270; "Divine Providence," nn. 141, 142; "Arcana Cœlestia," nn. 5711–5726, 8364; "Heaven and Hell," nn. 303–305, 569; "Divine Providence," n. 322.

THOMAS FRENCH, JR.

MEANS OF PROMOTING THE INNER LIFE.

In a previous paper* I tried to give the essential characteristics of the Inner Life possible to men on earth. From that statement a kind of definition may be formed which will serve to indicate the objective point of our present inquiry. The term 'Inner Life,' as it is used here, refers to a state of mind as well as to spiritual relations. It is a mind and life dominated and guided by a genuine love of God and the neighbor; or, more particularly, it is a quality of mind and life which constantly tends to unremitting service in the promotion of the higher welfare and happiness of others.

Both reason and experience show that this state of mind and life cannot be implanted in one from without; nor is it of sudden growth. It is reached only by slow training in successive mental reactions and in abundant practice. Behind the higher lives of men are long trains of ideas, feelings, and volitions, whose growth is from lower to higher kinds, and whose development is from those mental states which are weak and vacillating to those which are strong and enduring. When we consider the means which are most generally thought to promote this growth and development, we are frequently surprised to find how inadequate they are. The means of moral and religious culture most frequently used is direct instruction, or instruction by precept. But how often we find that the persons who received this kind of moral instruction in early life are later entirely indifferent to the lessons learned. Not infrequently these carefully instructed persons actually lead immoral lives. The uncertainty and unreliableness of efforts to inculcate by instruction the higher spiritual virtues is even more apparent, especially if the instruction is directly religious. Better by far that there be no religious instruction, than that such instruction be forced or misapplied.

* See the New-Church Review for April, 1909.

The reading of good books, too, is frequently found to be equally uncertain in reaching the moral sense, especially of young people. Indeed, direct moral reading, like direct moral instruction, is sometimes so obnoxious to children that it is only by compulsion that they have any part in it.

A cultivation of the fine arts, especially of painting and sculpture, is sometimes regarded as very efficacious in promoting the higher moral and spiritual lives of men. If a thorough knowledge of these arts were an effective spiritual force, then artists and sculptors would be models of fine thinking and high living, — a condition which by no means characterizes the minds and lives of all of this class of persons.

Possibly the hearing of music is the most overrated agency of moral and spiritual culture. There are doubtless people who, with a good ear for music, actually believe that they are experiencing exalted spiritual states in listening to a symphony rendered by an orchestra. They would be among the last to admit the truth that they are realizing in their pleasurable sensations the beginnings only of a genuine life of the spirit; and that, without accompanying words to awaken thought, the music serves only to stir the emotions.

In all these means of culture there is at best but the occasion of an intellectual or emotional state of greater or less strength and of little ethical value, unless the excited idea or emotion finds expression in repeated outward acts. It is here that the true relation of the outer and the inner lives of men may be fully realized. Here it is that the value of pragmatism as a philosophy is most clearly seen.

It is safe to say that the two problems which have most occupied the attention of thinking persons in the past, and which still continue to occupy their attention, are those which relate to man's mortal life: the first being the true ends or purpose of life here in the world; and the other, the best means of attaining those ends. Let us briefly examine these two problems in the order given.

There are people in the world — fewer now, probably, than

ever before — who spend their entire time in trying to wrest from the soil the means of a bare subsistence; and there are those of factory life who also exhaust all their time and strength in keeping soul and body together. To most people their solution of the problem of life's purpose is not a satisfactory one; and yet we must admit that their lives are not essentially lower, spiritually considered, than those of that large number of persons who make physical pleasures the chief end of their existence. Indeed, of the two kinds of life mentioned, the striving for food, clothing and shelter, even when there is nought else in life, is far more likely to give certain joys of the spirit to the worker, than the violent and selfish struggle for worldly pleasures can possibly do. To work for others from any motive is far better than to work for self as the seeker for earthly joy must do. And there is hope in mere efficiency; for the thrill which attends successful achievement, even of the humblest kind, has in it a stimulus to effort and a promise of power in the higher regions of the soul. Such efforts wait only for the spark of neighborly love to raise them into the higher realms of the spirit.

With this idea of our vocational life, we are able to get a dim vision of the spiritual possibilities of even so sordid a life as the life of the worker for mere material ends.

If we would get a firm appreciation of the fact that inner activities grow out of outer ones, we have only to question ourselves about the commonest things of life. Why do we feed and clothe the body? Is it merely to satisfy a passing necessity? Does not every one know that we do these things that the body may properly perform its function? But what is the proper function of the body? Surely not merely to keep itself alive! There must be some function beyond that. It may be to mend the roads, or to preach a sermon, or to sell goods. In any case, it is to do something for the good of other people, to render service for the welfare of others. This is one step toward a full realization of the conditions included in the definition of the Inner Life already given. The conditions of this defini-

tion involve a series of exalted efforts and motives, not the least difficult of which are those in which the service rendered passes from the low plane of the body to the higher plane of the spirit.

In studying the parts of an animal or a plant, we know that every perfectly developed part has a well defined function; and that, if we do not know the function of any given part, we may infer from the form of the part and otherwise what the function is. That is, the function of this particular part becomes as real to us as if we observed it.

In studying well-developed men, we may do the same. In the ordinary daily life of every one, there are innumerable movements of the body and of parts of the body; and behind these numberless movements there are judgments, emotions and volitions, also without number. These judgments, emotions and volitions are of every possible variety, animating every possible kind of activity. In the most spiritually developed men, there are qualities of living which seem simply impossible to naturally minded men, but which serve to show not only what is possible for men on earth, but also what men ought to do to perfectly live their lives. These spiritually minded men succeed as they do, not by indulging in pleasing emotions of philanthropy merely, not by halting with unfulfilled intentions, but by actually carrying out into the life the good intentions they have.

Thus far I have dwelt upon the importance of the daily life as providing the opportunity for expressing, and thus deepening and fixing, the impressions that are made upon the mind. We may well claim importance for it for another reason; and that is, for the superior ethical and spiritual ideals it furnishes. We all know that the strength and durability of a mental impression, be it of the intellect, feelings or will, depend upon the kind and frequency of the occasioning cause. There is hardly a moment of our waking hours that does not furnish the occasion of impressions of the strongest kind and of the greatest variety. Sense perceptions in countless profusion are being transmuted into ideas and thoughts. Emotions of all kinds are excited, images are fashioned, choices on every plane are made, and

judgments are formed not occasionally but constantly; and these mental processes are of the strongest kind; for every one knows that observing an object or action gives a more lasting impression than hearing or reading a description of the same object or action, or even seeing a picture of it. From experience we all realize the strong influence of example, especially upon the young. Thus it is that the observation of acts of truthfulness, honor, reverence or any other personal virtue, is far more effective in fixing that virtue in the minds and lives of observers than any other means could be. Compare, for example, the constant influence upon a boy of a father's example of repeated acts of honesty in business, with any amount of advice in that direction. The child of the honest man is led by his very nature to imitate the acts of the father, until good habits of honesty are formed. Later, as a youth, he becomes conscious even of the father's inner motives, and he is often led to adopt them as his own. The child who has instruction only in honesty, even if it be the best, is not so wise or free in his choice of ideals as he who has the direct and constant influence of good men's lives.

Just how it is that the thoughts and acts of the Inner Life can grow out of the thoughts and acts of every day life, is difficult to understand. That there is, by means of practise, an improvement in proficiency and facility of acts of the same kind, is well known; but how the improvement can be such as to change utterly the inner quality of our deeds by changing our point of view, is not easy to see.

It is well for us first of all to realize the necessity of an entire change of view-point, if the improvement is to be constant and enduring, — a change from looking to ourselves as the center and source of the good things we do, to acknowledging that God alone can through us do such things. This acknowledgment, be it understood, is not a vague or general one; but one that is clear and definite, belonging to every consciously good deed. We can see in such an acknowledgment, that no possible refinement of what may be called the natural life will ever re-

sult in a life which is in any degree spiritual. We talk much very properly, of the necessity of uniting religion with life. It is precisely here that we can do this; and it is at this point, in smallest measure at first, that the Inner Life begins. The mind now for the first time exercises the power of faith, begun it may be most feebly. This new power is most freely and intelligently exercised when a proper preparation has been made in a lower plane of life.

A concrete example of the beginnings of spiritual life may be helpful. A child, it may be, has dim ideas of the moral worth of truth-telling, and has indifferent success in living up to his ideas. By degrees it dawns upon him that living the truth in act is far more important than speaking the truth; and his standards of daily living in this respect are gradually raised, until he sees that a standard of truth in act or speech, to be reliably depended upon, must be higher than any human standard can be, and that the logical outcome of a dependence upon self as the source of truth must inevitably be such a devotion to self as to nullify all the good which the truth is supposed to embody or convey. For the first time ideas of God come into his conscious thought and life. They may be the whisperings of his childhood; or they may be from the influences of later years. He may have had the instruction of Sunday-school teachers or of pious parents. He may have even connected himself with the church. But he begins to realize for the first time, while he has been living to the truth as he saw it, that a new power has come into his life. From this time on he is glad to think of himself as one who serves; and he rejoices as never before in the truth which indeed makes him free. While the beginnings of his Inner Life are doubtless affected in a greater or less degree by the quality of the moral life which he has led, it is by the free exercise of his will that the new choice of spiritual ideals is made, and followed. His progress in the new life is likely to be very slow; and a continuance of that new life is only possible by means of patient practise in his every-day duties. Above all he sees that ideas of God as the source of

the good and true things should not be held in the mind without expression in life; for nothing is more deceiving than a merely sentimental possession of religious ideas; and nothing is more satisfying and stimulating than a comparison of states in which one's ideas at different times are applied to life. It is by this comparison of states in which one's choices are made, and by continual practise in life, that progress in spiritual, as well as in moral, life is effected.

One very potent influence in shaping our Inner Life as well as our outer, is that of the meditations which occupy so much of our time. We do not realize how much time is thus employed, or how influential in character-forming meditations are. The important point is, that we deliberately choose them, or they would not be there. If we have the power to choose what to believe and what to deny, we surely have the power to determine and control in a large degree our thoughts and feelings. They are as guests whom we invite to our home as counsellors and friends. We should seek to know thoroughly these companions of ours. On close scrutiny we may be surprised to find that some of them are not fit companions for us, or are not worthy of our highest ideals. For example, we may find our minds habitually occupied with planning schemes for making money, or with devising ways of securing some personal advantage over others; or we may find them dwelling upon fancied slights and unkindnesses of friends, or, it may be, absorbed with petty personalities, or trivial defects, of others. If we find such foes of our household at all dominant, we have nought to do but to turn them out. And we can perhaps do that best by bidding to our home more worthy guests. This is done by devising ways of putting our work upon a higher plane, or forming plans for making it more effective, and hence more useful. It is done by thinking over Scripture passages and gems of literature that we have committed to memory; or by praying within ourselves for guidance and strength. In these ways our moments of meditation may be the means of great spiritual help.

Thus briefly I have tried to show not only that the Inner Life is promoted by the ordinary life as it may be lived in the world, but also that it is promoted in the best possible way by such a life. No other influence for good that men can devise is so potent as this. Indeed, we are warranted in believing that the great purpose of the earthly life is to cultivate a life of the spirit. This does not mean that all the means now generally employed for instructing men and arousing their best emotions, should not be resorted to. But great care should be taken in the choice of these means of training, especially in respect to form, kind and amount of stimulus, lest the truths gained or emotions excited remain without adequate expression, and thus the last state of the receiver's mind be worse than the first. And the stimulus should be such as points to a good and useful life. For, as already indicated, it should be known that there are few conditions of mind more dangerous spiritually than the continuance of right feelings and choices that find no expression in outward deeds. In thinking of such a condition one is reminded of the familiar saying of Dr. Johnson, that "hell is paved with good intentions."

The most desirable features of moral and religious instruction belong to all the agencies commonly employed for such instruction. These agencies may be in oral or written form, as circumstances require. It may be given to persons individually or collectively, depending in part upon the immediate purpose of the instruction. The instruction may be by measured poetry or by simple prose; by interesting story or by plain exhortation. It may be by means of representatives of real and ideal life painted upon canvas, or chiselled in marble, or acted upon the stage.

Whatever the form of instruction may be, it should be remembered that each has a message that is determined by the needs of the learner; and the higher the plane of the message the better. But this message should have, at least, something for the Inner Life. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that to be most effective, the message must be indirectly given or

given symbolically. It may seem strange to us that all moral and spiritual lessons to reach men most effectually must invariably be thus veiled; and yet experience supports the general idea. Besides, we cannot forget that it was said of the great Teacher and His words to men, that "without a parable spake He not unto them."

And, finally, the moral and spiritual lesson is not complete unless the truth taught is such that it can be embodied in the lives of those for whom the lesson is given. So it is that good instruction has always in it some impelling force to action in life.

Of the means ordinarily used for purposes of moral and spiritual culture, the one that should be most effective is now really the least so. I refer to the dramatic representation of real life. If what I have said of daily living as a means of training has in it any measure of truth, — that is to say, if the ordinary life of man here in the world affords the best opportunities for promoting the Inner Life, — then the actual portrayal of such a life ought to be most influential both in furnishing worthy ideals and in giving strong incentives to action. The possibilities of the drama in this direction have not been really tested. Up to the present time it has been chiefly for purposes of pleasure or recreation, when it has not descended to baser uses. The Greek dramas merely reflected the ideals and life of the Greeks with all their external standards and superstitions. As a consequence, there was little in them that could be said to be genuinely spiritual in its influence. The drama of the middle ages consisted largely of miracle and morality plays in which there was an effort to raise the thoughts of people to a contemplation of moral and religious subjects. The failure of these plays to fully accomplish their ends, and their subsequent decline, were due partly to the unpreparedness of the people, and partly to the fact that the promoters of these plays sought to reach men by direct personal appeals and by wordy arguments rather than indirectly by action, — a mistake which should be a warning to all teachers of morals and

religion, especially to all teachers of the young. But faulty as the plays of that time doubtless were, they were continued as an active force in various countries for several centuries. One survival of them, the Oberamergau Passion Play, shows not only what they might have developed into, if the people had been ready, but also what is possible in this direction in the future. Surely such throngs of people would not flock to this little village to see enacted the story they know so well, unless there were something above the letter in the story, and unless the people were willing and ready to receive the higher lesson.

A hint of what is possible for the drama with the right kind of plays and the right kind of acting, is given in two plays which have been acted in some of our cities recently. These plays, "The Servant in the House" and "The Passing of the Third Floor Back," have in them genuine lessons of spirtuality in the presentation both of personal ideals and of personal incentives and efforts. The interest awakened and sustained in the presentation of these plays has been most remarkable.* Their success shows that in one city, at least, the interest of the people does not depend upon sensational melodrama or grotesque caricatures of human beings, as so many of our modern dramatic performances are. Upon the assumption that the people of the cities in which the plays were so successful are not unlike other people, it shows that a large number of people like best what they need most, and that the most potent lessons of the Inner Life are given indirectly by dramatic representation and in symbols. Something of the power of such a presentation is felt in such plays as Maeterlinck's "Blue Bird," now being played in our large cities.

Very significant is Swedenborg's reference to the kind of instruction that is given in the other life, — quite different from much of what our instruction is here. "Knowledges," he says, "are not committed to memory, but to the life." All that is involved in this we do not know; but we do know (1)

* One of them was played in New York to crowded houses for eighteen months continuously.

that the things that are learned are promptly applied to the life of the learner, (2) that they are determined by the immediate needs of that life, and (3) that some of the lessons are learned indirectly through symbols or representatives.

When we consider carefully these supposed conditions of heavenly instruction, we find that they agree remarkably with the conditions of instruction in a well-ordered earthly life, especially in a life that is growing and developing spiritually day by day. We find, in the first place, that symbolic and indirect instruction is more effective than direct instruction in the inculcation of moral and spiritual truth. That is, to acquire any virtue, the learner does well to see and experience its applied value objectively and incidentally rather than to learn it directly as an isolated fact. We find, too, that those good and true things are absorbed either from experience or from instruction which are immediately needed in the life. Useless matter is rejected or ignored, and serviceable things are retained. In this way the interest of the learner is awakened and sustained, and acquisition is most agreeable. And, finally, we find that, by at once applying them to the life, the things so acquired become fixed as a permanent, joyous possession.

These are the conditions of instruction at its best; and they are the conditions of life at its best. We live in this respect as we learn; and the lessons of instruction therefore become lessons of life. Of course, the conditions of life in this world are far from perfect. But we should be profoundly grateful to the Giver of life that the conditions are such as they are; for this is a world of choices between things good and evil, and there could be no choices unless there were evil things as well as good between which the choices could be made. We should be grateful, too, for the abundant opportunity which life affords to apply the choices we make, and so to make them our own.

With this view of life as a means of regeneration as well as of instruction, our daily duties take upon themselves new dignity and grandeur, however menial they may be; and all our

social and civil relations are greatly exalted. Moreover, direct instruction with eternal ends has in it an element of consecration which instruction with lower ends has not. In such instruction the earth of man rejoices in the thought of bringing heaven so near; and his heaven is glad in the prospect of coming down to earth.

JOHN T. PRINCE.

RELIGION AND FORMAL WORSHIP.

THE purpose of this paper is to consider what relation, if any, exists between religion and formal worship, — meaning by 'religion' the regenerating process in heart and mind, and by 'formal worship' those outward acts in which man tries formally to express his acknowledgment of and reliance upon his Creator, or more exactly, the public services of the church. It must be understood that the term 'formal' is not used with reference to the specific form which such services take. The question of 'ritual,' in the popular use of the word, is not at all involved. But most of us hold the view that men ought to go to church, and in some definite and, I think we may say, formal way give expression to the religious sentiments which such an act involves. And if we are of this opinion, it may be well for us to give thought to its ground and basis, that we may not be at a loss if we are asked the reasons for our conviction. For while we have been holding to it, with more or less firmness, the public in general has been moving rapidly in quite the opposite direction. Everywhere more and more the feeling obtains that, so long as a man lives the best life he can, church-going is needless, if not useless. And what is more, the same sentiment seems to be gaining ground with many professed New-Churchmen, even with some who are real believers in the Heavenly Doctrines and who study them earnestly. Considering these things we say to ourselves in some amazement, "Can such a view be right? And if it is not, what shall we say in answer to it?"

We may realize more fully the importance of giving thought to the subject when we reflect that the very existence of the New Church, or of any church, as an ecclesiastical organization, seems to turn upon this point. For the greatest part of our external activity is devoted to the maintenance of churches

and of formal worship. So that if we cannot show men any sufficient reason why they should come to church, we had best either cease our labors altogether, or divert them into some other form of use. For what is a church without a congregation?

Allowing, then, without argument that the growth of the true New Church in the souls of men will go on even without our help, — allowing that "the man of the church makes internal worship essential and external worship not so essential," — nevertheless we, as members of the organized body of the New Church, find in the subject before us an important and almost vital question. What, then, are a few of the reasons we we can give men why they should go to church; and how can we show something of the importance which formal worship may have for the religious life?

In the first place, formal worship, in spite of present appearances, has always seemed to fill a universal human need. History gives us few if any records of peoples, however barbarous, among whom some form of cultus has not prevailed. The form and character of the cultus sometimes falls very low indeed; but nevertheless the general striving toward something of actual worship seems clearly to indicate a general and common tendency of mankind in that direction.

The character of worship is of course usually considered to have developed upward in a regular order of evolution. And there is perhaps a measure of truth in the idea. But at the same time there are many facts which seem to point to a common origin of at least several historic forms of worship in something higher and purer than has come down to us in history's records. The doctrines of the New Church teach us that this higher prototype was in fact a system of formal worship actually established by Divine revelation with the people of the Ancient Church.

But if the historians are fairly, if not quite correctly, agreed as to the course of the worship tendency, its cause is something which it is more difficult to account for on naturalistic grounds. Indeed it is hard to explain the phenomenon adequately except

in the way expressed in the beautiful saying of St. Augustine: "Oh Lord, Thou madest us for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it repose in Thee." This is the view which is taken in the writings of the New Church, where we are taught that the desire to be in some worship is common to all, and exists among all nations; that it comes not merely through the observation of natural phenomena, but by a dictate from the Lord through the angels; and that those who do not have it are under the dominion of infernal spirits. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1308.)

The force of the need of formal worship may be more specifically illustrated by a consideration of the history of the Christian Church. According to Dr. A. V. G. Allen of Cambridge, Mass., in his book entitled "Christian Institutions," Christianity itself could not attain its first full growth until the craving met with some response. The first public meetings of the Christians, as he tells us, were devoted mainly to giving and receiving instruction; and there was little if any observance of a devotional character. Any attention to outward form was supposed to be out of keeping with the spiritual character of the new faith. So long as this idea prevailed the religion had a comparatively slow growth because of the appeal which the formal worship even of Paganism made to the popular mind. But from the time when Christianity itself adopted a service of prayer, praise, and devotion, as well as of instruction, the hold of the old superstitions began to be loosed, and they disappeared with marvelous rapidity.

In spite of its unspeakable corruptness of doctrine, the Roman Catholic Church, into which Christianity degenerated, continued to satisfy men's hearts through the centuries, at least partly, by its fulfilment of the same longing for formal devotions. Nay, even so recently as the last century, the eminent Thomas Erskine, of the Church of Scotland, stated his belief that "It is the emphasis on worship that holds the masses of the people in the continental countries of Europe so true to the Papal Church, and in this country it is this that has been the chief cause of the growth of the Episcopal Church."

And if we turn to the Word, here too we shall find the importance of formal worship stated, both in the Old and in the New Testament. For instance, we read in DEUT. xxvi, 10, "And thou shalt . . . worship before the Lord thy God"; in II KINGS xvii, 36 the command, "Him shall ye worship"; and most familiar of all, the inspired adjuration of PSALM cxv, 6, "Oh come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our maker."

The Lord while on earth clearly taught the value of the element of community in public worship when He said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (MATT. xviii, 20). And that He did not account even the most external forms of religious observance unworthy, His very words to the Pharisees show: "Ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; the latter" (to translate more literally), "ought ye to have done, *and not to leave the former undone*." (MATT. xxiii, 23.)

And yet in spite of all these facts the question of the value of formal worship in the present age may perhaps honestly arise. A great change has come over the world in the last century and a half — a change whose scope and character the deepest thinkers are only beginning dimly to recognize. Mankind may in some sense be said to be reaching its intellectual majority. The race has new aspirations, and feels new needs. Perhaps, then, the old needs are felt no longer, and the necessity for formal worship is past. Possibly even the Bible's commands were, in their letter, but an accomodation to the spirit of their own times, and have a different application to-day.

Indeed, there seems to be one very natural reason for the present popular abandonment of worship. When we find so deep a student of men as Swedenborg declaring of his contemporaries, "Most people at the present day suppose that they are to come into heaven solely by virtue of holy worship in temples and of adorations and prayers" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 126[2]), it is small wonder that a strong reaction should follow the re-

jection of so pitifully shallow a falsity. But is it not also reasonable to suppose that the trend of our day is to the other extreme, and that a true middle view must be attained before human life can come again into a normal state?

It is not strange, however, that in the doctrines of the New Church, upon whose outward expression we must certainly admit some influence from the time in which they were given, the emphasis should almost everywhere be placed upon the emptiness of formal worship that is merely formal and nothing more. From this fact many earnest students of them have been inclined to neglect external worship altogether, and to hold that a life of shunning evils as sins is all that is necessary in this new and spiritual age.

But although mankind has grown, or is growing, up, there does not seem to be sufficient evidence that its essential character has changed, even to the extent of no longer feeling the need of formal worship and devotion. Recent writers are fond of speaking of the "spiritual unrest." May not the lack of satisfactory fulfilment of this very need be one of its factors? For in the greater part of our churches the ideal of worship seems to be dying or dead. It is hardly surprising that men will not trouble to go to church when no real inducement except to be interested or entertained is offered them for doing so. They can hear better music at the theatre or the opera; and they can read articles in any good magazine which intellectually are far above the average sermon. But if the ideal of worship could be put before them in a practical form, — if it were proclaimed that going to church could actually help them to do their best work during the week, — might not their attitude in the matter be considerably changed?

Something of this fact is occasionally being grasped; and the result is some measure of success, even though the effort often extends no farther than to a mere externalism. In the gradual adoption of a more definite and worshipful form of service even among the Methodists and Unitarians, we see an indication that the devotional spirit is not dead, but perhaps dimly groping for

something that will give it a new and deeper expression. For even if the movements we have spoken of were in themselves but a fruitless attempt to go back to a condition that is past and dead (and I think there is more in them than that), yet even so their existence would serve just as surely for proof of the permanence of the worship-tendency.

But what should be the attitude of the New-Churchman toward it all? In the first place he is right in saying, as we did in the beginning, that the place of first emphasis belongs to the true, internal religion, and to the life of use. On the other hand, however, he makes a real mistake if he supposes that the doctrines of his church deny or belittle the value to the spiritual man of formal worship that is conducted in the right spirit. Instead, they repeatedly affirm it, even though the affirmation is often affixed to a caution against mere formality. We read, for instance, that, "To make worship formal without its essential is to make internal worship external. . . . But it does not follow from this that there ought not to be external worship" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1175); also that, "The real worship of the Lord consists in performing uses," but, "frequenting churches, the hearing of preaching, and prayers are also necessary" (*Ibid.*, n 7038). The emphasis upon the higher truth in such passages in no way lessens the validity of the lower, though it has probably had just such an effect for many honest readers.

In other passages we have the necessity of external worship still more forcibly stated; as where we read, "But man, while in the world, ought not to be otherwise than in external worship; for internal things are excited by external worship, and by it also external things are kept in holiness, so that internal things can flow in"; and further, that by external worship, "man is gifted with states of holiness of which he is unaware, which are preserved for him by the Lord for the use of eternal life" (*Ibid.*, n. 1618[2]). We are even told that in heaven there is external worship which is "in form not unlike that in the world." (Heaven and Hell, n. 221.)

In such passages and many others the fact of the value of

formal worship is unmistakably affirmed. But it is in the doctrine of "ultimates" that the reason for this value seems to be most clearly shown. We learn from this doctrine that there is and can be nothing in the universe which is permanent, fixed, and stable until it has an ultimate form in which it may dwell and subsist. The principle is true of the greatest and of the least of things. The universe itself could not exist and remain, until the ultimate of dead matter was created for its foundation. The very natural degree of the Lord existed only potentially until by His life on earth the Divine Humanity became the corner-stone of a new temple wherein God might dwell among men. And a desire or a thought can have no real connection with any one of us, unless we make at least an effort to give it an ultimate in outward act.

Now if it be true in general that "the internal does not exist without the external, for the external is the ultimate and base in which the internal subsists" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5247[6]), we are surely justified in applying the principle in some measure to external and internal worship. Does not, or cannot, external worship form a base or ultimate, upon which our sense of trust in the Lord and of acknowledgment of His goodness can rest more firmly than upon any other?

It may perhaps be objected that the true ultimate of religion is in a life according to the Commandments. But an ultimate must be the ultimate of a motive; and it scarcely appears that the effort toward practical usefulness, by itself, completely ultimates all the motives of the religious life. For this really consists of two parts: (1) looking to the Lord; and (2) shunning evils as sins. The motive of trying to shun evil, or to do what is right, is certainly fully expressed in a life of righteous activities; but the motive of looking to the Lord seems to require something more. And as this looking to the Lord, and acknowledging our powerlessness apart from Him, is precisely what is meant by internal worship (on which so much stress is laid in the doctrines of the New Church), it seems not unreasonable to suppose that it ought to find expression in external, or what

we have called formal, worship. Is not this, in fact, the reason why the importance of external worship is so clearly stated in the doctrines of the New Church?

We may realize from such a thought something of the great value which external worship may have for every one of us, if we will make it truly serve as a plane for the internal. For although we are taught that without "the humiliation of self before the Lord," which is internal worship, there can be no regeneration, yet that very state is one of the hardest for us, with our proud modern individualism, to attain. But if we would only build up a foundation for it by a conscientious and devout observance of formal worship from a really religious motive, we should find our difficulties marvelously made easy. The Lord Himself would have us use this means which He has provided for us; for we read:—

> Divine Love is to want worship . . . not for its own sake but for the sake of man and his salvation; for he who worships the Lord . . . is in humiliation; and *proprium* recedes from him who is in humiliation, and in proportion as this recedes the Divine is received. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10646.)

Finally, perhaps the strongest of all indications of the duty of the New-Churchman with regard to formal worship is the teaching of the Church about Baptism and the Holy Supper. We are sometimes inclined to forget the high position which is assigned to these "holiest things of worship" as means of man's reception of good and truth from the Lord. Baptism, we are taught, actually changes the spiritual environment of the person baptized. And "to those who worthily come to the Holy Supper, the Lord is present and opens heaven." Yet these very sacraments are acts of formal worship, even though they are the highest of them, and though they have a sanctity from their representative character which other formal acts do not equally possess. And we read of the acts of praying, kneeling, singing, and so forth that:—

> With those who are in a life according to truth . . . these things are

pleasing to the Lord, for they are effects of the spirit in the body . . . and so are not natural postures, but spiritual acts. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 126[2].)

Perhaps we should not close without reiterating the statement made above, that in all this discussion there has been no idea of any particular form, or set of forms, of worship as being alone, or chiefly, effective. That there must be some form, if our worship is to be common and public, seems evident; but what that form shall be, use should decide. There will always be some to whom forms will most appeal that have been hallowed and made beautiful by the tradition of ages; and others who will find usefulness in forms more modern and more adapted to their individual states. An elaborate service will be more inspiring to one type of mind, a simple one to another. Even in heaven we are told that external worship has innumerable forms. So long as the form preserves order and decorum, — so long as it invokes a true spirit of reverence, — so long, above all, as it gives the wondrous inspiration of a unanimity among many, — the Lord will surely be present in it according to His promise.

After all, the only conclusive proof of the value of formal worship, as of anything else, is the testimony of experience. The true and earnest church-goer will come to find in that hour on Sunday, help, comfort, and strength for all the days of the week. He will find that religious sentiments and ideas, like all others, reach their truest development through expression. And though he may not realize it, the attitude of reliance upon the Lord, which formal worship helps to fix securely in his heart, will thus come into being in all that he thinks and says and does. He has literally as well as spiritually obeyed the command, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

We have then, as members of this little New-Church body, a message about formal worship for those to whom our voices can reach. It is no mere return to an empty and outworn formalism; it is the old worship made new. Let us try to

quicken again something of the devotional spirit which of old was the inspiration of saints and the comfort of penitent sinners. Let us try to realize and to declare that formal worship should be no more an irksome or negligible duty, but a source of practical usefulness and of abiding joy. Let us strive to come into the spirit of the man after God's own heart, who sang, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord."

E. M. Lawrence Gould.

TRUTHS NEEDED BY THE WORLD.

All who read them were much impressed by the statistics gathered a few years ago by a member of the New-Church Club in Boston, showing that the majority of those whose experiences were tabulated had been drawn to the New Church by the conversation of a friend.

Knowing, as we do, that speech may have the quality of repelling as well as of attracting, in accordance with the affection and wisdom that are in it and with the state of the listener, we also know that great care must be taken in selecting subjects for conversation and in interpreting states of mind and heart, if we are to present our doctrines effectively. In this paper the writer will try to present some of the teachings of the Church that he thinks he understands in part; and, as they are of fundamental importance in understanding the Lord and His Providence, and in establishing character in the individual, they are often the subjects of his conversations with his friends.

Swedenborg was a man of devout nature and of very great scientific attainments. Since the remarkable tributes paid to his scientific investigations and discoveries and published to the world on the occasion of the removal of his remains to Sweden, and the papers and discussions in the Swedenborg Congress in London last summer, we should feel that no well-informed person need be told of the remarkable mind of the man. But to the New Church he is much more than a natural scientist; he is a seer. Differing in degree from other seers, because of his scientific training, and also because of the place the study of the Word had in his life, he could see more than others. Given both these facts, and his humility, it is no marvel that he walked with the Lord. We are warranted in saying to any inquirer who questions the experiences of Swedenborg, that they might be repeated in essentials in the life of any one of us who

would become as humble as he, and would make the reading and study of the Word his very life, provided there were similar need. Finding the Lord in all the Word promotes clearness of spiritual vision.

Life in this world establishes character. The New-Churchman yields to no one in ascribing goodness and love to the Lord. When the Universalist is reported as saying that God is too good to condemn any man, we assent; but we assert that man would not be man, and therefore worth saving, if he could not choose his own kind of life whether good or bad, unselfish or selfish. Swedenborg discovered the soul to the world. Of course others had written of the soul before his time; but in one particular they did not speak with conviction. And this, we think, their instruction lacked. We cannot imagine a human being as living under conditions essentially different from those we know in this world. The soul was thought of as the real man, but he lived in the body. Food nourished and supported the body; but little was said of the world of the soul, or of the food upon which it was nourished and matured. Without these facts rationally presented and demonstrated, the soul and its life were speculation only. The New-Churchman knows that from birth the spiritual world is the world of the spirit, and that the food of the soul is the truth of the Word. New-Church people seem to have been very slow to understand this. In dealing with children, whether their own or not, some have felt that there was need of subterfuge and deception. Feeding such food to the soul has its counterpart in the homely story of the man who gradually taught his horse to eat sawdust. The outcome was that when he had succeeded, the horse died. In exactly the same way, when the child has learned to take such food without protest, he is really dead to genuine life. Remarkable confirmations of the stand of the New Church in this matter have recently been published in the daily press. Several perfectly normal boys have been admitted to college courses, because qualified to profit by them; and yet they were in short clothes, and enjoyed the companionship and games

of youths of their own ages. The explanations given have been entirely simple. In so far as it has been necessary their parents have truthfully explained the life and environment of their child; but have never hesitated to say that it was not the whole truth. More would come with greater maturity. Thus they illustrated still more fully the fact that we shall never exhaust truth, even throughout eternity. In these cases we are further to observe that the boys were mainly concerned with natural truths. Swedenborg pursued natural truth in order to discover spiritual truth; and when he had discovered the relation of the two he could enter rationally into the study of the soul, its life and its activities.

The Christian Church has concerned itself through the centuries with schemes by which men, by imputation of a life which they have persistently refused to enter upon, may enjoy such a life. We have so many illustrations of the futility of imposing upon men even an unaccustomed natural life and environment, and expecting them to enjoy it, that it seems strange that they should so easily believe in this much harder substitution. The New-Churchman believes that the life of the spirit of the man, will become the life of his spirit through eternity.

At this point, some of us believe that the New Church does not go far enough in its teaching. It goes so far as to tell men that the life hereafter will be of the same quality as the life on earth. There will be nothing like the punishment with fire and torment that the old church has taught. The man says, "I shall enter upon a life there like the one here, which I quite thoroughly enjoy. I get everything for myself that I can and am quite successful, I shall hope to be equally successful there."

In one aspect this is the most dreadful doctrine that the Church teaches; and the world is becoming fully persuaded of its truth. But carried only so far, it does not appear dreadful, and there is little reason why men should care for religion. There must be a motive in life that will draw men out and away from this contentment with conditions as they are. We find

it in the spirit that pervades the groups of young people who are training for athletic contests. To them nothing is hard; and there are no restrictions of diet, of pleasures, of recreations, even of familiar intercourse, but will be willingly endured if thereby they may become more worthy representatives of the physical prowess of their school or association. Arguments much stronger than these may be made for so acting and for shunning the dissipations of the spirit, that we may enter upon and enjoy real life. As no function of mind and body in health is exercised in moderation without a real delight and satisfaction, so the soul exercises its functions with heavenly delight and satisfaction when it has been properly nourished by heavenly truths.

The nature of truth which is the food of the soul is different from that of facts. A fact is a known act. It is a fact that I have made a journey, that I have met a friend, that I know the chief events in a period of history. A truth enters into the life with power. Truth is not an abstraction. We should know that we do not need to concern ourselves with results when we have lived a truth, or stated it with conviction. The marvelous progress of the New Age is due to the truths the New Church is exemplifying in its life. If we were to name the most impressive event in history since the time of our Lord, we should point to Swedenborg in his summer house, with his Bible before him, writing of things seen and heard in the spiritual world, and saying with perfect confidence that from that very time the light would shine more clearly into the world, and would result in the progressive extension of freedom to individuals throughout the world. History everywhere records the fact, but few know the cause. The nearest approach to appreciation of it, is the reliance upon publicity as a power to correct industrial and political abuses.

The simplest truth about life is that it is made up of selfish or unselfish acts. The former lead to the perversion and death of the soul, and the latter fill it with life. Selfishness lessens the capacity of the soul to receive life from the Lord; unselfish-

ness enlarges the soul's capacity. Young people are capable of understanding this truth, if presented in this way. They want to be whole men and women. They want to drink deep of life. But they have never been taught the nature of life, and the good of living it. Life has been presented rather as the abuse of life; and joy, as dissipation. We have talked about conscience and the virtues, and the words have had little or no meaning. Recently a professional man, of many years experience as a Sunday-school teacher, was not able to avoid the conclusion of the members of his class, that all men are hypocrites. One way of defining conscience is in terms of the effects of supposed conscientious acts upon the individual actor. Does it make him more charitable towards his associates and more ready to do them service; or has he become more bound up in himself and censorious of others? The practice of the virtues may be defined in the same terms.

We know that we are free to act as we please. This is not saying that the Lord will keep his hands off, as it were, and let us go to the bad without any effort on His part to keep us from evil. We are never called upon to choose, and made responsible for our choices, except to the extent that we understand the nature of the choice presented to us. Self presents every inducement to be selfish; and the Lord surrounds us with His special providence. We act in an equilibrium, in perfect freedom. A selfish act restricts the life within us; but after the act the equilibrium is again established, but on a lower plane. The same is true of an unselfish act; but the life becomes fuller thereby, and the equilibrium is restored on a higher level.

We need this doctrine at the present time particularly, because so much is being said and written upon the effects of heredity and environment. We should know that no untoward condition of physical life and surroundings handicaps the soul. The author of "Cranford" shows us how full was the life in the little village. It was an epitome of the great world about them.

In this brief paper we have tried to point out some of the

teachings of our Church which the world greatly needs to know. They may be restated as follows: —

1. Given the need of making known to the world the Nature of the Last Judgment, the Doctrine of Correspondences, and the Unity of the Attributes of God, and any other man as well educated, as devout, as rational, and as unselfish as Swedenborg, might have similar experiences.

2. This world establishes Character. In the other world we shall be what we have been interiorly in this world. Therefore there is every reason for our making our life here fuller and fuller of the Divine life by learning to live unselfishly.

3. Truth concerning life is itself a living thing.

4. We are always living with freedom of choice; but the equilibrium is continually changing to one on a higher or on a lower level.

WALTER A. ROBINSON.

HEBREW, GREEK AND LATIN.

All four of the Gospels tell us of the title or superscription written on the Lord's cross: "Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews;" and two of them mention the fact that it was written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. The superscription itself is of great interest and significance. It excited the angry protests of the chief priests, who said to Pilate, "Write not, The King of the Jews, but that he said, I am King of the Jews." But their objections were ineffectual. "Pilate answered, What I have written I have written." And so the proclamation went forth to the end of time, that He who suffered that cruel and unjust death was the promised Messiah, — the son of David, who should sit upon his father's throne, and upon his kingdom, "to order it, and to establish it, with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever." This was inscribed on His cross, and could never be changed.

Moreover, it was written in three languages. Aramaic or Hebrew, the language of the Jews of Palestine, Greek, the language current throughout the East, and Latin, the language of the Roman conquerors, were all used to designate this reputed malefactor. No one who witnessed His crucifixion could doubt that He was declared to be "King of the Jews." Whatever honor or reproach was attached to that name belonged to Jesus of Nazareth. Pilate's thrice written title announced this fact to the whole civilized world. We can indeed go farther and say that the truth of our Lord's Messiahship is the central teaching of Divine revelation. It pervades alike the Old Testament and the New; one of which was given to mankind in Hebrew, and the other in Greek. Nor can we forget that it is the fundamental doctrine of the New Church, and thus, again, found expression in the Latin tongue. Surely this association of the three languages cannot be a mere coincidence.

It is interesting to note that Hebrew, Greek and Latin are dead languages. That is to say, they have ceased to be, in their original form, the languages commonly used by any country or people at the present day. The Jews, as is well known, are dispersed throughout the world. Not for centuries have they existed as an independent nation. Wherever they may be, they speak the language of those among whom they live. They cherish and preserve their Scriptures just as they were first written; but the Hebrew is no longer in any sense their vernacular tongue. So far as they employ it among themselves in speech or writing, it is not pure Hebrew, but a kind of hybrid, variously modified according to the localities in which they dwell. Similar is the case with Greek. The modern or Romaic Greek, while formed of the same letters, and bearing a certain resemblance to the Greek of ancient times, is in reality a widely different language. Then, too, as everybody knows, the Latin is nowhere used as a spoken language, though it is, to a greater or less extent, an element in many languages.

Hebrew, Greek and Latin are dead, in the sense that they long ago ceased growing. Their literature is a finished product, incapable of further development. All their words have fixed definitions, which never can be changed. A thousand years hence each word will mean the same that it means now. In a living language like our own, the case is altogether different. Old words are constantly dropping out, and new ones appearing. Our whole vocabulary is in a state of flux. The terms familiar to one generation are often unintelligible to another. For example, since the King James' version of the Bible was made, just three hundred years ago, not a few phrases have lost their former meaning. When the translators wrote, "Take no thought for the morrow," the idea which they had in mind was, "Be not anxious for the morrow"; and so the sentence has been rendered in the revised version of 1880. In like manner the "narrow" gate has been substituted for the "strait" gate, because in the progress of the language the

latter expression had been outgrown. Many other archaisms of a similar kind might be easily cited, all of them going to show that living languages are continually changing, and cannot be permanently relied upon to express the thoughts originally intended.

But with the dead languages it is altogether otherwise. Like the pole-star, they are always to be found in the same place. How plainly providential it is, that those we are considering have been made the vehicles of Divine revelation, — of truth which is to endure forever! Each of the three has its own special characteristics, adapting it to its own particular purpose. The thoughts of the Old Testament are most perfectly expressed in Hebrew, and those of the New Testament in Greek; while it would be easy to show that the Latin, more than any other language, is suited to doctrinal definition and exposition. We must not, however, lay claim to knowledge on these points, beyond what we possess. This, at least, is certain, that we have, in the three, a trine of sacred languages; and it seems more than probable that they are, in their relation to each other, celestial, spiritual and natural. Is not the Hebrew suggestive of the simple and childlike period of the race, the Greek, of its intellectual or rational development, and the Latin, of its concrete power and authority? End, cause and effect are doubtless imaged in them, and in some sense they must cover the whole range of human thinking.

We moderns, however, cannot forget that most of us are unacquainted with the ancient languages, and have access to their literature only through the medium of translations. This opens to us a most interesting and important subject. In the first place, we cannot fail to see that a translation, however excellent it be, is never a complete substitute for the original. There are necessarily certain features of the original, which no other language can fully express. As different as are the separate nations of the earth, and the periods in which they flourish, so different are their vernacular tongues. Each has a distinct character of its own. Each stands for a special state or

phase of human life which is not wholly communicable. The mere intellectual transfer of ideas from one language to another can always be made more or less successfully. But to one who is fully imbued with the spirit of the original no translation can ever be a perfect equivalent for it.

Moreover, the constant variations in living languages are a factor which cannot be lost sight of. The translation of yesterday is often insufficient for the needs of to-day. Who supposes, for instance, that any existing version of our English Bible is a finality? In the very nature of things new translations or revisions will continue to be called for, as long as English is spoken. Reference has been made to the changes necessitated by the growth of the language since the time of King James. If we go back still further, the contrast between past and present is even more pronounced. The translations of Wyclif and Tyndale are far more remote from our modern forms of expression than those of the authorized version. As for the latter, admirable and beautiful though it is, and justly preferred for ordinary reading, it by no means meets the requirements of such as wish to be students as well as readers of the sacred text. The preacher or teacher of Scripture, who is unfamiliar with the original languages, cannot dispense with the help afforded him by the revised version. No English-speaking minister ought to prepare a sermon without consulting it.

Still further, not only are the living languages always changing, but our knowledge of the dead languages is always growing more full and exact. Numberless possibilities in this direction are suggested by the progress already made. Philology, which may be defined as the study of words or language as such, is a science of recent date. It deals with the various languages of the earth in their relations to each other, traces them to their sources, groups them according to families, shows the root-meanings of words, and their distinguishing characteristics. Under this treatment fresh life is imparted to what would appear to be in itself a dry subject. Words become things, and

possess the same interest that attaches to other things which have a substantial existence and history. Considerations of this kind must appeal especially to New-Churchmen, to whom such wonderful teachings are given with regard to the Divine Word. For "the style of the Word," so we read, "is such that holiness is in every sentence, and in every expression; yes, in some places in the very letters: hence the Word conjoins man with the Lord, and opens heaven" (Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture, n. 3). Surely from the point of view thus presented nothing which relates to the language of Scripture can be without significance. Take further into account what is said in various places about the Hebrew, and its connection with the language of heaven, and our interest in, and reverence for, the least particulars pertaining to the sacred text cannot fail to be strengthened.

When we come to consider the translating of Swedenborg, we find that it is equally affected by the constant changes in the English vocabulary and by the advancing knowledge of Latin. To this may be added increased intelligence on the part of translators as regards Swedenborg's own meaning. The earliest attempts at rendering his Latin into English were necessarily crude and imperfect. Just what his words really meant was not always clear; and the result was in great measure a collection of anglicized Latinisms, which, themselves, needed explanation. But, as the doctrines became better understood, this difficulty grew less and less. Thus Swedenborg has been, and will ever continue to be, his own interpreter. Fresh translations of his writings will doubtless be in demand for a long time to come. Or, more probably, they will never cease. This is no reflection on any translation which we now have. It simply recognizes the fact that work of this sort must needs be progressive, or, as some might say, an evolution from faulty beginnings to greater and greater degrees of perfection.

Some simple illustrations may here be of interest. They are such as may occur to any student of Swedenborg's Latin in the course of his reading.

1. Take the word *supremus*, which is commonly rendered "supreme." Its literal and original meaning is "highest." Together with the alternative word *summus*, it is the superlative form of *superior*, which means "higher." Now, in the development of the English language the idea of authority has become associated with "supreme"; insomuch that the first definition in the Century Dictionary is "Highest, especially in authority; holding the highest place in government or power." This meaning is still further emphasized in the cognate word "supremacy." But Swedenborg rarely, if ever, uses it in that sense. He means simply "highest." For example, in speaking, as he often does, of the three degrees of truth in the Word, he denominates them, after the three heavens, not only natural, spiritual and celestial, but also lowest, middle and *supremus*. Any one can readily see for himself that "highest," rather than "supreme," is the more fitting translation of the last named word. Yet, as was said, we do not find it generally so rendered in our English editions.

2. Another example of somewhat similar character is afforded by the two Latin terms *universus* and *universalis*. These words appear to have been always translated as if they were synonymous. But the fact, I am convinced, is far otherwise. *Universus* is used by Swedenborg in the sense of "whole" or "entire," whereas *universalis* is rightly translated "universal," the meaning which is commonly assigned to both. A striking illustration of the difference may be found at the beginning of the "True Christian Religion." On the title-page we read, "The True Christian Religion, containing *universam theologiam Novæ Ecclesiæ*," which has been invariably rendered "the universal theology of the New Church." Substitute "entire theology" for "universal theology," and you get quite another idea, which is evidently the one intended. In the very opening paragraphs we are told about "the faith of the New Heaven and the New Church in its universal and particular forms"; and here the word used is *universalis*. It is, moreover, expressly said that "a universal of faith is that which will be in the whole

and every part," a very different thing from what is entire or complete.

3. I do not know where the expression "Grand Man," in the English translations of Swedenborg, had its origin; but the Latin is *Maximus Homo*, meaning "Greatest Man." It is the term used to designate the full aggregate of human beings, in this world and the other, who are living according to true order. It is the largest single unit of finite humanity, — the most perfect image and likeness of God. We are taught that it appears as one man in the Lord's sight. There are other forms of collective man, such as an earthly nation or a heavenly society; but *Maximus Homo* is the greatest of all. Surely that is the best name for it, which tells most exactly what it is. It may be grand, in the common acceptation of the word. That is to say, it may be, and doubtless is, of imposing magnitude. But such is not Swedenborg's idea. He simply gives expression to the fact, already stated, that of all aggregations of human beings in the created universe, this is the greatest. Would it not be more truthful, and therefore better, to translate the term accordingly?

4. One more point in connection with the translation of Swedenborg may usefully be mentioned. It is well known that the Latin language, unlike the Hebrew and Greek, has no definite article. Hence it becomes necessary for translators to exercise their discretion, in all cases, with regard to inserting it before a noun. Take, for instance, the word *homo*, which we have just been considering. Shall it be rendered "*the* man," "*a* man," or simply "man"? This question must always be answered according to one's judgment as to the requirements of the context. It will be easily seen that the difference in meaning may often be considerable, — indeed, fundamental; so that the point is one of great importance. My opinion is, that the prevailing tendency among our translators has been to insert the article needlessly, and that they could adopt no better rule than to leave it out, except where the sense plainly demands it. Even the titles of some of Swedenborg's works are affected

by this matter. "The Heavenly Arcana Disclosed, which are in the Sacred Scripture or Word of the Lord:" such is the first part of what we read on the title-page of the Rotch edition. But why say, "*The* Heavenly Arcana," as though there were no other "arcana" beside them, which might have been disclosed, if there had been occasion? The fact is, as Swedenborg himself declares, that the hidden truths of the Word which he was instrumental in revealing, were as nothing compared with those which remained unrevealed. Hence the phrase should obviously be, "Heavenly Arcana," meaning only *some* of the innumerable things lying concealed in the Sacred Scripture. The value of this distinction is emphasized by our knowledge that certain interpreters have maintained that the book, just as it is written, contains the whole internal sense of Genesis and Exodus, as it exists in heaven; which would be impossible.

But this branch of our subject has been pursued far enough; and we return to more general considerations. When we have a correct conception of what language really is, it becomes a most interesting and delightful study. Instead of being dull and dry, it is full of life. What, indeed, can touch the lives of men more closely, than that which serves as a necessary medium of communication between them? The condition in which they would find themselves without language, is almost impossible to imagine. Intelligent speech is one of the chief characteristics by which they are distinguished from the lower animals. When we think deeply about it, what a marvellous thing it is, this power of clothing invisible thoughts with outward sounds and shapes which carry them, through eyes and ears, to the minds of others! There is truly nothing within the range of human experience, that is more wonderful.

Swedenborg's statements concerning the language of heaven are of great interest. He says: —

> All in the whole heaven have one language, and they all understand one another, from whatever society they come, whether near or distant. Language is not learned there, but is natural to every one; for it flows from

their very affection and thought. The sound of speech corresponds to their affection, and the articulations of sounds, which are words, correspond to the ideas of thought which are from affection; and, because language so corresponds, it is itself also spiritual, for it is affection sounding, and thought speaking. (Heaven and Hell, n. 237.)

Here we have a suggestion of the origin of language; and it is soon afterwards clearly stated, as follows: —

I have been told that the first language of men on earth was in agreement with angelic language, because they had it from heaven; and that the Hebrew language agrees with it in some respects. (*Ibid.*, n. 238.)

The man to whom words are something more than mere arbitrary signs or sounds, looks upon them almost as friends and acquaintances. He always sees in them the marks of their character and history. Mis-spellings, — especially intentional ones, — are a kind of violence offered to them, which detracts from their beauty and significance. This may seem at first an extravagant assertion; but, if we have any conception of language as being the embodied form of truth, we cannot bear to see it mutilated. And surely this embodiment is what it ought to be. A satirical French writer once said that words were invented to conceal thoughts; and quite too often, it must be confessed, such is the use made of them. But heavenly speech and writing are the concrete outflowing of loving thoughts and affections. Human language approximates the heavenly, just so far as it is the transparent expression of perfect truthfulness. According as men grow in goodness and wisdom, their words must needs become more self-interpreting and luminous.

I have spoken of language as the wonderful agency by which man conveys the hidden things of his mind to his brother-man. But that is not its highest function. It is, above all else, the means whereby the Lord reveals Himself to human beings. He speaks to them throughout all time in the Sacred Scriptures, giving them knowledge of His will and law, and of His care over them. Most expressively are the Scriptures called His

Word. They are the living medium through which His truth is imparted to them, and which serves to bring them into communion and conjunction with Him.

So we come back to the point where we began. "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews," our Lord and our God, lifted up on the cross in the sight of all nations and of all generations of men; He it is, of whom these Scriptures everywhere testify; His was that imperishable title and superscription. Who can adequately estimate the debt we owe, and shall forever owe, to Hebrew, Greek and Latin?

JAMES REED.

THE WORD IN HEBREW AND ITS TRANSLATION.

THE Authorized Version of the Bible was first published in the year 1611. The present year is the three hundredth anniversary of the publication of this version. Wyclif's translation appeared in the fourteenth century; Tyndale's was published in 1525. A number of other translations appeared before the Authorized or King James version. The fact that this version has endured and has been received with increasing favor for three centuries shows that it possesses many excellent qualities which have endeared it to successive generations. Many people are satisfied with it as it stands, and are averse to any change. Its very phrases are entwined in their affections, and a change of wording seems to them almost like a desecration. The demand for a revision of the translation arose principally from the scholars who, from a knowledge of the original, knew of the defects of translation in the Authorized Version. The Revised Version, although published twenty-five years ago, has made little progress in displacing the old.

In the New Church there has been from the very beginning a desire for a new translation based on the principles taught by Swedenborg. Before the Revised Version was published, some of our scholars believed that it would fulfil the needs of the New Church by giving a faithful rendering of the original Hebrew and Greek. The translation has not fulfilled their expectations. So the problem remains for the New Church to provide for its needs by making its own translation. The English Conference and the American General Convention have committees at work preparing a translation of the Word. The English Committee has completed a translation of Genesis, and is at work on the book of Exodus. The American Committee has translated the book of Psalms, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, and is now at work on the prophet

Isaiah. This Committee has also done a large amount of preliminary work. It has collected all the translations of passages into Latin made by Swedenborg, and has arranged them in a card catalogue, making constant use of them in its work. It has also a vocabulary of all the Hebrew and Greek words translated by Swedenborg, with reference to every place in his writings where they are quoted. This collation was made by the late Rev. Louis H. Tafel. A summary of this work was made with four duplicates, one of which is used by the English Committee.

Swedenborg brings to light many things concerning the Word which are not known by translators in general. He viewed the Word not only in the light of the scholarship of the world; he viewed it also in the light of heaven. He perceived the Word from the spiritual sense which the literal sense was created to contain. He shows that the very peculiarities of the letter of the Word are expressions of important spiritual principles. In fact the Word in the letter is like the human body, and the spiritual sense is as the soul (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 1–5). As the soul builds the body into correspondence with itself, so the letter of the Word is built by its spirit to correspond with itself. The letter is an exact expression of its spirit, corresponding with it in its most minute particulars. The Word is not a mere aggregation of scattered fragments of literature and history; it is a body which has been formed to represent the Divine love and the Divine wisdom in corresponding natural forms. Swedenborg reveals the Word from its spiritual side. He reveals it in an entirely new light which manifests in the letter many excellencies never before perceived. The literary forms derived from many sources have been built up into a structure which is truly Divine because expressive of the Divine wisdom; even as the human body built up of many chemical elements is truly human, because it embodies and expresses the qualities of the human spirit. If these principles are unknown, it is evident that they cannot be used as guiding principles in making a translation. This we find to be the case in the translations of the Word.

In the Old Testament in the Hebrew every word, and even every letter and curvature of a letter, is inspired. All things are representative and significative of spiritual and Divine things. There is not a point or jot which does not affect the angels when the Word in the original is read by man. It is from this quality that the Word is Divine and inspired as to the very letter. The Jews have been preserved as a nation especially for the sake of the preservation and use of the Word of the Old Testament in the original Hebrew. The real letter of the Word of the Old Testament, which is inspired as to the letter itself, is the Hebrew, which Swedenborg teaches has been preserved from the beginning. He distinguishes between the letter and the sense of the letter of the Word. We cannot transfer the letter itself into another language. A translation is the expression of the sense written in other letters and words. A true and good translation is a faithful rendering of the sense of the letter, so that anyone reading it may get the sense of the original. A translation, however, cannot contain the qualities which are contained in the words, letters and jots of the Hebrew. Thus we learn that:—

> The Jews in the other life read the Word in the original language, and from their ideas derived from that language itself the celestial angels apprehend the celestial things which are in the Word; for the correspondence of that language as to the syllables is with celestial forms. . . . All the letters or syllables in it have a correspondence, and according to the inflections and curvatures they signify internal things according to the heavenly form. (Spiritual Diary, nn. 5619, 5622.)

The reading of the Word in Hebrew connects by correspondence with the celestial or inmost heaven. It has this effect with the Jews even when they are not in the interior principles themselves which are represented. The Word in the Hebrew will always have its use as the exact containant by correspondences and representatives of the Divine Wisdom itself. It will always serve a special use in the implantation of the influences of the celestial heaven. It will always be the containant of the infinite Divine Wisdom to which the ministers and scholars of the

church must ever go. A translation, however excellent, can never displace the original Hebrew and Greek as the very letter of the Word of God. A translation serves to bring the sense of the letter of the Word to people in their own language. The aim in every translation should be to render the sense of the Hebrew in the mother tongue, as accurately as possible, so that the translation may serve as a means of conjunction with heaven and for the implantation of the knowledges of truth and of heavenly states of life.

Swedenborg frequently calls attention to one important quality of the Word; namely, that there is as it were a marriage in its very expressions. These are the ultimate in which rests the Divine marriage of Love and Wisdom in God. This marriage is shown in the two names for God in the Old Testament, Jehovah and Elohim, translated in the Authorized Version, Lord and God. These two names express the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom. Wherever used, alone or together, it is for the specific purpose of describing the operation of the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom in man's reformation and regeneration. These two names as used in the first two chapters of Genesis are for this definite purpose. They are not, as the higher critics suppose, indications of different origins of these two chapters. These accounts are as much one as the two eyes of the body are one in design and use. In like manner the two names of the Lord, Jesus and Christ in the New Testament, are used in the Word to express similar qualities in Him. This duality extends to the minute particulars of the Word, as may be seen from the following: —

In the Word, particularly in the prophetic Word, there are two expressions for one thing; the one having reference to good and the other to truth, which are thus conjoined (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 683, 707, 2516, 8339). It cannot be known what expression has reference to good, and what to truth, but from the internal sense of the Word; for there are appropriate words by which the things of good are expressed, and appropriate words by which the things of truth are expressed (*Ibid.*, nn. 793, 801): and this so constantly that it may be known merely from the words predicated, whether the subject treated of be good, or whether it be truth (*Ibid.*, n.

2722). Frequently one expression implies what is general, and the other expression implies a certain specific particular of that general (*Ibid.*, n. 2212). There is a species of reciprocation in the Word (*Ibid.*, n. 2240). Most things in the Word have also an opposite sense (*Ibid.*, n. 4816). The internal sense follows its subject according to what is predicable of it. (*Ibid.*, n. 4502). (New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine, n. 265.)

Again we read: —

That there are in the Word two expressions which appear like repetitions of the same thing, may be seen by readers who give their attention to this: as, brother and companion, poor and needy, waste and wilderness, void and emptiness, foe and enemy, sin and iniquity, anger and wrath, nation and people, joy and gladness, mourning and weeping, justice and judgment, etc., which appear to be synonymous, when yet they are not so: for brother, poor, waste, [void,] foe, sin, anger, nation, joy, mourning, and justice, are predicated of good, and in the opposite sense, of evil; but companion, needy, wilderness, emptiness, enemy, iniquity, wrath, people, gladness, weeping, and judgment are predicated of truth, and in the opposite sense, of falsity. And yet to the reader who is not acquainted with this arcanum, it appears as if poor and needy, waste and wilderness, void and emptiness, foe and enemy, are one thing; and so, too, sin and iniquity, anger and wrath, nation and people, joy and gladness, mourning and weeping, justice and judgment: and yet they are not one thing, but they become one thing by conjunction. Many other things, also, are joined together in the Word, as fire and flame, gold and silver, brass and iron, wood and stone, bread and water, bread and wine, purple and fine linen, etc.; and this because fire, gold, brass, wood, bread, and purple, signify good; but flame, silver, iron, stone, water, wine, and fine linen, signify truth. So when it is said that they are to love God with the whole heart and with the whole soul; and also, that God is to create in man a new heart and a new spirit; for heart is predicated of the good of love, and soul [and spirit] of the truth from that good. There are also words, which because they partake of both good and truth, are used by themselves, others not being joined with them. But these things and many others are apparent only to the angels, and to those who while in the natural sense are in the spiritual sense also. (Sacred Scripture, n. 84.)

Translators who are unacquainted with this principle, — namely, that the Hebrew words of similar meaning have definite reference to good or to truth, — frequently transpose them, and thus confuse the influx of heaven into these terms. This is

shown by an examination of the translations. In the Vulgate the terms for man, *adam* and *ish* are frequently transposed. In the Authorized and Revised Versions both are translated man, the English language being deficient in words suitable to express the difference between these Hebrew words. Swedenborg and Schmidius uniformly translate *adam* by *homo*, and *ish* by *vir*. In the Authorized and Revised Versions the words expressing joy and gladness are often reversed, thereby confusing the spiritual sense. The same is the case with other dual expressions. No attempt is made to keep distinct English terms for corresponding Hebrew terms, even where it is quite easy to do so. In fact the translators of the Authorized Version definitely announced their decision not to attempt to keep such distinctions. In the preface of the 1611 edition it is said: —

> Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe that some learned men have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signifies the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense everywhere), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by "purpose," never to call it "intent"; if one where "journeying," never "travelling"; if one where "think," never "suppose"; if one where "pain," never "ache," if one where "joy," never "gladness," etc., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savor more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously?

This practice of commingling celestial and spiritual terms runs through both versions. The decision of the translators not to attempt to give the specific meaning of the Hebrew words in English but only the general idea, has resulted in utter confusion as to the specific sense of the original. The latest circu-

lar of the publishers of Young's Concordance calls attention to this fact, and that one of the merits of the Concordance is that it will enable the student to find the original Greek and Hebrew word used in every passage of Scripture. Swedenborg, however, teaches that each Hebrew word has a specific meaning distinct from other words as may be seen from the following: —

That blasphemy is predicated of evil speaking and false speaking about God, and thus about Divine truth, it is unnecessary to confirm here by many passages from the Word; not only because any one can see that blasphemy is nothing else in the spiritual sense, but also because there are various kinds of it; consequently in human languages, as in the Hebrew, there are various terms by which the kinds of blasphemy of God and of Divine truth are expressed, such as calumny, contumely, ignominy, opprobrium, reproach, rebuke, jesting, scoffing, mocking, and others, each of which is used in the Word with a generic and specific difference, to analyze and explain which would require many pages. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 778[12].)

By an examination of these words expressing the different terms for 'blasphemy' and comparing them with the English translation, we find that no attempt has been made to preserve the specific differences of meaning which Swedenborg teaches are embodied in the Hebrew words. Each Hebrew word at times is translated by an English word which more specifically represents the meaning of some other Hebrew word. This confusion in the translation is strongly put in the report of the Committee of Convention on the Translation of the Word printed in the *Journal of Convention* for 1877. In the paper written by the Rev. L. H. Tafel, we read: —

Each of the following English words serves to translate 10 or more different Hebrew roots, so that 10 or more roots in the Hebrew, expressive of as many different ideas, are all inextricably mingled under *one* English term; of nouns: body has 10 supposed equivalents in the Hebrew; commandment 10, fear 10, multitude 10, part 10, reward 10, riches 10, work 10. Bough, measure and ruler have 11 supposed equivalents; place 12, captain 13, side 13, border 14, substance 14, branch 16, end 16, sorrow 19, company 20, destruction 21, and strength 30. Some adjectives are used just as vaguely: *goodly* serves to translate 11 different Hebrew words,

pleasant 12, great 15, mighty 20. Verbs are in even a worse confusion, as the following examples will show: to abide, hold, increase, mourn, overthrow, perish, pour out, rejoice and to think, serve severally to translate 10 different Hebrew roots; to bear, cry, gather together, fall, give, kindle, set up, shut, slay and to smite, have 11 such Hebrew equivalents; to bind, catch, grow, lift up, look, remain, rest, show, speak, spread and to stay each serves to translate 12 different Hebrew roots; to reside, consume, consider, depart, faint, tarry and to utter, 13 roots; to burn, cast down, divide, leave, move, offer and to vex, 14; to regard, remove and to trouble, 15; to grieve and to make, 16; to bring forth, cover and to cut off, 17; to be afraid, cease and to gather, 18; to cast, 19; to take away, 20; to appoint and to put, 21; to deliver, 22; to break and to come, 23; to fail, 27; to bring and to take, 30; to destroy, 40; that is, there are forty different Hebrew roots that are at various times translated with to destroy, so that the learned reader cannot by any possibility know from the English which of these words is used in the original. Prepositions also are translated in a great many different ways: 10 Hebrew words are translated *to*, 12 against; 13 beside; as many, by; 14 from; 16 with; 17 before, and as many, in.

Nor let it be said, that the English language is too poor to furnish an equivalent for every word in the original, for the common version itself disproves this. If we take for example the word *destroy*, which is used to translate 40 different Hebrew roots having widely different meanings, we find that King James' translators have used 80 English expressions to translate these 40 different roots in other passages with this same general idea of destroying. . . .

The most numerous examples of such variations we find in the verbs, as the following list may show: —

The Hebrew verbs signifying: to diminish, delight, forsake, scatter, sing aloud, break, overflow, dwell, go astray, and to blow, have each 10 different translations. The verbs signifying: to burn, inquire, requite, crush, mention, distribute, stumble, hasten, die, wither, blossom, acquire and to judge, have 11; the Hebrew verbs signifying to be courageous, sojourn, cease, change, alter, withhold, lay, shoot, atone, acknowledge, spread abroad, hallow, shout and to corrupt, have 12; those signifying to bind, tread, ask, glow, bow down, rove, stay upon, tell, witness, give pledges, encounter, besiege, reap, draw near, tremble, strive, accept, be like, bereave and to repeat, have each 13 different translations; those signifying to destroy, bless, live, contain, thrust out, journey, straiten and to make light, have 14; those signifying to eat, believe, be broken, draw, touch, approach, afflict, arrange, and to be wonderful, have each 15; those signifying to seize, become great, be sick, be gracious and to feed, have each 16; the verbs signifying to be polluted, drive out, cut, smite, break forth and to answer, have each 17; the

verbs signifying to open, call, place and to keep, have 18; those signifying to cleave, take, fill, wander, serve and to shut up, have each 19 translations; to gather, uncover, descend, break in pieces, and to ask, have 20 different translations; to make glorious, turn, exalt and to slacken, have each 21; to add, and to sit, 22; to speak, 23; to find, 24; to discern, do good, consume and to multiply, have each 25 different translations; to be and to stretch, 26; to establish, fall and to turn aside, each 27; to travail has 30, to encompass 32, to stand 34, to see 35, to take hold of and to arise 37; to visit has 38 different translations; to go out has 42, to come 46, and to know, 48 different translations; to ascend has 51, to go 53, to pass 54, and to bear, 56 different translations; to make has 78, and to give, 83 different renderings

The passages where dual terms come together are like a glorious antiphon of male and female voices, one expressing the love and affections of heaven, the other the wisdom and thoughts thereof. They are like the mutual responses of Moses and the sons of Israel on the one hand, and Miriam and the daughters of Israel on the other, singing the song of deliverance from the oppression of Egypt. The more perfectly the work of translating these phrases is done, the more full of heavenly life and light will be the reading and singing of the Word.

We must not think that the rendering of these Hebrew words into English can be easily effected. There are many difficulties which must be met and overcome. One is that the Hebrew words have a broad signification which is not fully covered always by any one English word. This breadth of meaning is spoken of by Swedenborg as follows: —

> There are many words in the Hebrew language which contain a complex of many ideas in one, from opposite to opposite, so that the sense cannot be understood but from the series, and this from the interior, otherwise than is the case in other languages, because they were in representatives, so that in one general idea might be many things. (Spiritual Diary, n. 2833.)

This breadth of meaning in some cases requires that a Hebrew word in different places shall be translated by several English words to express fully the meaning of the original. The meaning in each place must be determined from the series. Yet a careful translation will avoid the great confusion of terms now manifested in the present versions.

Swedenborg speaks of the series and the very order of the words in the Hebrew as having an important bearing on the meaning, especially on the spiritual sense. The critics frequently suggest emendations of the text on account of supposed grammar, sequence, or similarity to the order of the words in other places. Swedenborg shows that the very peculiarities criticised are there because they express definite spiritual ideas. We will refer only to some statements concerning the first chapters of Genesis. We read: —

> Love is the greater light which rules the day, and faith from love is the lesser light that rules the night; and because these make one, "Let there be" is said of them in the original in the singular number, and not in the plural. (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 30, 34.)
>
> That the words contain hidden things concerning regeneration may also be evident from its being said in the former of these verses, that the earth should bring forth the living soul, the beast, and the wild animal of the earth; and in the following verse, in another order, that God made the wild animal of the earth, and then the beast. For at the first, and afterward until he becomes celestial, man brings forth as if from himself; and so regeneration begins from the external man, and proceeds to the internal. For this reason there is here another order, and external things precede. (*Ibid.*, n. 47. See also nn. 52, 53, 89.)
>
> The state of these antediluvians is fully described in this verse, in that they were cast out of the garden, or separated from celestial good; and that there were placed at the east of the garden of Eden the cherubim. Because they were of such a nature it is said, "from the east to the garden of Eden" — words which are only applicable to them, and could not be said of those that lived afterward — of whom it would be said, "from the garden of Eden to the east." So it is said "The flame of a sword" turning itself; but if said of those at this day it would be, "A sword of flame." Nor of these would it be said "the tree of lives," but "the tree of life" — besides other things in the series that can never be explained, being understood only by angels to whom the Lord reveals them. For every state has numberless arcana not one of which is known to mankind. (*Ibid.*, n. 312.)

Sometimes there is difficulty in determining the sense in particular passages, especially when scholars and critics have assigned more than one meaning to a Hebrew word. An instance of this occurs in GEN. xl, 16. Pharaoh's baker told his dream, saying, "Behold three *white* baskets on my head," —

as rendered in the Authorized Version. The margin has instead of white, *full of holes*. The Revised Version translates it, "Three baskets of *white bread* were on my head." Gesenius refers to the Vulgate, the Mishna, and the Arabic, in support of the translation *white bread*. Schmidius translates it *similagineorum* (*panum*) that is bread made of fine flour. Swedenborg in the "Adversaria" quotes it thus from Schmidius; but when he translated it in the "Arcana Cœlestia," he rendered the Hebrew word *chori* by the Latin word *perforata*, that is perforated, or full of holes. On this translation he bases his spiritual interpretation, as may be seen from the following explanation: —

Perforated were on my head. That this signifies without termination anywhere in the middle, is evident from the signification of perforated, as open from highest to lowest, thus not closed, and accordingly without termination anywhere in the middle; . . . The sensuals which are subject to the voluntary part are now treated of, and by the baskets perforated on the head is signified that the interiors were without termination anywhere in the middle, and for this reason those sensuals were rejected and condemned — as will be seen in what follows. But it may be well to state what is meant by being without termination anywhere in the middle. Man's interiors are distinguished into degrees, and in each degree the interiors are terminated, and by termination separated from the lower degree. . . . Thence it is that man as to his interiors, if he lives in good, is a heaven in least form, or, that his interiors correspond to the three heavens; and thence it is that man after death can, if he has lived a life of charity and love, be transferred even into the third heaven. But that he may be such, it is necessary that all the degrees in him should be well terminated, and thus by means of terminations be distinct from one another; and when they are terminated, or by means of terminations are made distinct from one another, every degree is then a plane, in which the good which flows in from the Lord rests, and where it is received. Without those degrees as planes, good is not received, but flows through, as through a sieve or perforated basket, even to the sensual; and then not being directed to anything on its way, it is changed into what is filthy, which appears to those who are in it as good, namely, into the enjoyment of the love of self and of the world, consequently into the enjoyment of hatred, revenge, cruelty, adultery, and avarice, or into mere voluptuousness and luxuriousness. This is the case if the things of man's will are without termination anywhere in the middle, or if they are perforated. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5145.)

The Hebrew word *chori* here translated "perforated" is derived from the word *chor* which is generally translated "hole." The same root also means to be white. The baskets were not white, nor filled with white bread; this would have represented the good in the will, or the will receptive of good; but the baker was hanged, therefore we can see that the very series shows that this translation is incorrect.

The Hebrew idioms, too, present difficulties; also those places of the prophets where there is little coherence in the literal sense (as where there seems to be merely a series of names), although there is a coherent spiritual sense. An instance of a peculiar phrase is found in Isa. v, 1, where we read in the Authorized Version: "My well beloved hath a vineyard in a *very fruitful hill*," marginal reading, "*the horn of the son of oil*." The Revised Version renders it "a very fruitful hill," margin, "*a horn, the son of oil*." Commentators say this means "a very fruitful hill," a conical hill shaped like a horn, a son of oil meaning fruitful. Swedenborg, however, bases his interpretation of the spiritual sense on the literal rendering, as may be seen from the following:—

By the vineyard which belonged to the beloved in the horn of a son of oil is signified the spiritual church which is in truths from the good of love, thus which is most excellent, for a vineyard signifies the spiritual church, or the church which is in truths from good; the inauguration thereof is understood by the "horn of oil," forasmuch as inaugurations were performed by oil out of a horn, and a son of oil signifies truths from good. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 375.)

Again in explanation of the same we read:—

In these words there still lies concealed such an arcanum as cannot be expressed by any forms of speech; for by these words is fully described the conjunction of the Lord's spiritual kingdom with His celestial kingdom. . . . A vineyard signifies the spiritual kingdom; in a horn denotes in power: thus a son of oil therein denotes the external good of love in the celestial kingdom; for this kingdom which is the inmost heaven from the Lord, is called oil or olive yard because oil denotes the good of celestial love. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9139.)

"The horn of a son of oil" exactly expresses the spiritual meaning, but the spiritual sense is lost in the expression "a very fruitful hill."

The letter of the Word as expressed in the Hebrew of the Old Testament embodies by correspondence the very qualities of heaven itself. It is impossible to transfer the fulness of its meaning into any translation; yet the nearer the translation comes to the original the more fully will it bring the Divine influences to men through the study and reading of the Word. Swedenborg uses various expressions to designate the Word. There is the letter itself, then the sense of the letter (which he defines as that nearest to the words), the Word in the letter, the literal sense, the external or natural sense, the Word in ultimates, all of which expressions are used to designate that sense which is apparent on reading the Word. This is the foundation and the containant of the spiritual sense. We can see from what has now been shown, that the nearer we come to expressing the very sense of the original in a translation, the more perfectly will that translation serve as a means of conveying to men the Divine love and wisdom which are embodied in its spiritual sense.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

ARE THERE IMPERFECTIONS IN SWEDENBORG'S SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATIONS?

On page 135 of the preceding number of The New-Church Review, the Rev. Harold S. Conant presents a very interesting study on the question, "Are there imperfections in Swedenborg's Scripture Interpretations?" and by these interpretations he means those revelations of the internal sense of the Word that it was the especial mission of Swedenborg to deliver to the world; and our esteemed brother then gives no fewer than fifteen instances of what would undoubtedly be very serious imperfections of the nature in question if nothing could be said in explanation. Of these instances of seeming imperfection the great majority are taken from a single work, namely, the "Apocalypse Explained."

It is a pleasure to meet with a writer on this subject who does not begin with a declaration that such imperfections do exist in the theological works of Swedenborg, but who puts the question of their existence in the interrogative form; and it is by no means a matter for regret that such researches as these should be made, or that the results of them should be published, provided that this is done in a good spirit; for if such imperfections as are here meant do really exist in these works, it is on all accounts very desirable that their existence should be made known by one who is a friend of the works, and who holds an affirmative attitude toward them. The time is coming when these works will be fiercely attacked by some of the ablest men of the Christian world, and when no pains will be spared to expose mistakes in them if such are to be found there. It is therefore one of our present duties to prepare beforehand, and especially to study, and to fortify, if this be possible, all the weakest points in the line of our defences. I have no hesitation in saying that this is possible, and also not difficult, provided

that in attempting it we speak and act with a sagacious and faithful adherence to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The first point that I will direct the reader's attention to is the very significant fact that not only these difficulties of the paper before us, but also most of the similar difficulties that have been found in the works of Swedenborg, have been found in the "Apocalypse Explained."

Swedenborg was certainly one of the most careful and painstaking writers who ever lived, for it was customary with him to write a very complete preparatory work before he wrote the work itself that he sent to the printing press. Thus as a preparation for the "Arcana" he wrote the great work called the "Adversaria"; the "Last Judgment" had a preparatory work of the same name; the "Holy Scripture" had one called "De Verbo"; the "Divine Love and Wisdom" had a forerunner at the end of the "Apocalypse Explained"; the "Conjugial Love" had one in a large work now missing; and the "Apocalypse Revealed" was hugely prepared for by the 1992 quarto pages of the MS of the "Apocalypse Explained."

This last named preparatory work, although at first intended for publication, was never completed; but as soon as the author had arrived at the tenth verse of the nineteenth chapter of the "Revelation," he seemed to stagger in the unfolding of it, jotting down a few brief notes, and then dropping his pen altogether in so far as the work in question is concerned. The words at which Swedenborg thus seemed to stagger, and which seemed to cause him to break short off, are the very remarkable ones uttered by the angel to John the Evangelist, who had fallen at the angel's feet to worship him: "See thou do it not; I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God, for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." And the words that follow these are precisely where there begins the account of the Second Advent, the Last Judgment, the formation of the New Heaven and the New Earth, and the descent and description of the New Church

called the New Jerusalem. All these vital and most interesting subjects as described in the Revelation of John are left out altogether, and the "Apocalypse Explained" is here a total blank.* It was in the year 1759 that Swedenborg ceased to write his first great work on the Apocalypse, and it was not until the year 1766 that he published the magnificent final result of his studies and labors on this closing book of the Word in the shape of the work called the "Apocalypse Revealed," which is a comparatively concise work in which every word is made to tell in respect to the main subjects treated of in the Apocalypse, but is by no means a mere condensation of its expansive forerunner.

I have been thus particular in explaining the history and relative status of the "Apocalypse Explained," because I have desired this explanation to lead up to what I regard as a very important and fundamental principle, which is that in my opinion the authoritative Writings of the New Church consist of the works that were actually published by Emanuel Swedenborg, and of these alone. I do not regard, and I have never regarded, his other theological works as being of equal Divine authority and of equal Divine enlightening power; and I consider it to be a great mistake to endeavor to make them out to be so, and as also being a great source of weakness in our defensive position. This was the reason why in compiling the "Swedenborg Concordance" I placed in a separate division the extracts from the works that were not published by Swedenborg. That these works are of supreme value no one knows better than myself; they contain whole volumes of invaluable matter on subjects that are not so fully treated of in the first great class of the works of Swedenborg. Especially are the "Apocalypse Explained" and the "Spiritual Diary" works of this nature, and no one values them more highly than I do; but still great as they are, and full of wisdom as they are, they are

* See Dr. Rudolph L. Tafel's fine explanation of this remarkable circumstance in his great work, "Documents concerning Swedenborg," Vol. II. page 1000.

in my well and long considered judgment not equal in enlightening power and Divine authority to the works that under the Lord's own especial care and Providence were published by His ever faithful and specially equipped servant Emanuel Swedenborg. It is right to state this principle here, because it comes to the front in my answer to Mr. Conant's paper.

Granting then the certainty of there being imperfections in the preparatory works written by Swedenborg, there still remains the question whether there are not also some imperfections in Swedenborg's interpretations in the Writings proper, that is to say, in those which were published by Swedenborg himself. To this question I will at once reply in the affirmative, for it is a most certain fact that there are imperfections in every work done by a human being, even when this human being is merely an instrument in the Lord's hands. There is only one Being who can do work that contains no flaws. And even He is not able to create another being of the same character, for this would be to create another God. Consequently every merely human being is liable to err; and how can a being who is all the time liable to err be capable of doing any work that is not liable to error? No one supposes that when Swedenborg was writing his works, even the most perfect of them, the Lord dictated to him in a living voice every word that he was to write. How then can all his words be infallibly correct? If he was left to choose his language, how could he always avoid making mistakes? Being human, and not Divine, he was of course always liable to do so, and the only wonder is that he has made so few mistakes. It is well known to Biblical scholars that even the letter of the Word is not free from mistakes, even in the Hebrew and Greek originals. It is the same with every created thing. Its creation involves its imperfection, because it involves its separation from the Infinite. There are spots on the sun; and the science of astronomy reveals the fact that there is no absolute perfection even in any motion of the heavenly bodies, for the imperfections of these need a constant rectification and compensation at the hands of their Creator,

who is the ever active Governor of the universe. It is the same everywhere. The Lord is absolutely perfect in Himself; but the moment that His creative power passes outside of Himself, it enters the domain of what is finite, and therefore of what is more or less imperfect. It is true that in itself the Word is infinite and infallible, but it is not so in its ultimate forms; and neither are the Writings of the New Church so in these forms even when they are drawn from the infinite fountain of the Word. In these ultimate forms they are finite, and therefore they are not absolutely perfect or free from flaws. Nevertheless for all practical intents and purposes they are of Divine authority. They have been given us by the Lord Himself, having been written, as Swedenborg has said, "by the Lord through" him. Practically this has been done; the Divine Providence has watched over every word and every teaching; and when mistakes have been allowed to pass, care has been taken that these have not affected any important doctrine or even minor teaching of the Church, and they have been of such a nature that men could detect them and render them innocuous. For more than a hundred years men have been finding mistakes, real or supposed, in these Writings, but in no case have they ever found any mistake that was of any practical importance. Such is also the case with these alleged mistakes that have been collected by Mr. Conant, as is manifest on the face of them. Let us now study them in the light of our best learning and common sense, and if they prove to be real mistakes let us candidly acknowledge them to be so, and by no means let us try to make them out to be anything but what they are, whether they be real errors or only imaginary ones.

1. At the outset Mr. Conant calls attention to the fact that in "Arcana," n. 5626, Swedenborg named Simeon as the brother, when he should have named Benjamin.

Although this is an undoubted mistake according to the strict historical sense, a brief study of the whole case will show that it is a harmless one. Israel's command to his sons was conveyed in the words, "Take your brother" (GEN. xliii, 13),

and these words are correctly quoted by Swedenborg, but at the moment he had forgotten that the brother here meant was Benjamin, and he says it was Simeon, and then gives the signification of Simeon. Now it was really the case that they were to take Simeon as well as Benjamin, for at this time Simeon was held a prisoner in Egypt and by taking Benjamin thither the other ten sons of Israel would obtain the liberation of Simeon, and would thus "take" him. The internal sense of all this shows very clearly that Swedenborg made in this instance no real or important mistake; for Simeon here represents the good of faith, or faith in the will; and not the mere truth of faith, but this truth turned into good by being loved and practised. And if we turn back to n. 5482 in the "Arcana," we find that the reason why Simeon was separated from his ten brothers was in order to represent the important truth that we can have no real good of faith unless there is an intermediate connection between us and the Lord's Divine truth. This truth is here represented by Joseph, and the intermediate connection with this truth is represented by Benjamin, who at this time was a full grown man and the father of ten sons. (See GEN. xlvi.) Many endeavor to get the good of faith without having any intermediate connection between themselves and the Divine truth of the Word, namely, by making a fallacious Divine truth for themselves out of their own heads and through the exercise of their own intelligence. But no real good can be obtained in this way, but only a spurious good, which is worse than worthless because it causes the man to be puffed up with a mistaken faith in his own goodness and wisdom. To show this, Simeon was separated by Joseph from his ten brothers, and was kept bound until Benjamin made his appearance in the land of Egypt. As soon however as this took place, Simeon was instantly set free and brought out to his eleven brothers, thus making the twelve complete. We see therefore that the ten brothers did practically take their other two brothers by taking Benjamin to Egypt; or in other words they took the good of faith (Simeon) by taking the connecting intermediate (Ben-

jamin); and it seems evident that this idea of the internal sense was present in Swedenborg's mind at the time he was delivering the internal sense of the words in question, "take your brother." I do not deny that he made a technical mistake by using an historically wrong name here; but I think that any fair-minded student of this part of the Word will regard this mistake as of no practical importance except in so far as it shows that Swedenborg was not verbally inspired, which is a real fact.

2. In his second item Mr. Conant points out that in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 600[19], Swedenborg has given *sinister* instead of *dexter* as the equivalent of the Hebrew.

This is a mere slip of the pen (corrected by Dr. Samuel H. Worcester in his scholarly edition of the "Apocalypsis Explicata," from the notes at the end of the several volumes of which Mr. Conant has evidently collected most of his materials), "left" being used instead of "right"; and Mr. Conant himself is in error in saying that an interpretation is apparently made on this basis, for a glance at the interpretation shows that this is not at all based on this slip of the pen.

3. The third case concerns the use of *Israel* instead of *Hierosolyma*, in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 444[6].

In this case it is very doubtful that there is any mistake at all; and therefore Dr. Worcester did not alter the text here, but merely inserted the note, "Perhaps with the Hebrew text you may read 'Jerusalem,'" evidently because the context and the internal sense show that "Israel" might very well be the correct reading, just as Swedenborg has given it. It is true that in the "Arcana" Swedenborg reads "Jerusalem," but only incidentally, and without basing any interpretation or internal sense upon it. Moreover the two proper nouns "Jerusalem" and "Israel" have a very similar signification, both relating to the Spiritual Kingdom, as "Zion" and "Judah," which are the cognate names, relate to the Celestial Kingdom; so that the internal sense is quite similar here in any case, and no serious mistake can have happened.

4. In "Apocalypse Explained," n. 340[4], we read *salvatio*, where the Hebrew requires *Israel*.

The first three letters of the name "Israel," in the Hebrew, are almost identical in appearance with the first three letters of the word "salvation" in that language, which may account for this reading or mistake, if mistake it be; or there may be a variety of readings here in the Hebrew MSS of the Old Testament, caused by this similarity in the form of the two words in the Hebrew. But in any case the internal sense is not much affected, if at all, as may be seen by a reference to "Apocalypse Explained," n. 340[4]; where we read that "the fountain of salvation signifies spiritual good, because through this is salvation." In this case also, therefore, it is evident that there is no serious mistake, if any.

5. In the fifth instance Mr. Conant says that in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 644[16], "we read simply *pluvia*, rain," where the word should have been "*serotinus*, the latter rain, or the evening rain."

Here Mr. Conant has omitted the word *suo*, so that he is mistaken in saying that "we read simply *pluvia*, rain." What we do read is *pluviam in tempore suo*, and in the "Arcana" passage *pluviam in tempore serotinam*, so that the real difference lies between *suo* and *serotinam;* and as, contrary to Mr. Conant's assertion, no interpretation is apparently based by Swedenborg on this difference, the matter seems hardly worth mentioning.

6. In "Apocalypse Explained," n. 721[18], we find the word *non*, although it should have been *No*, an Egyptian city.

In this case it is true that Swedenborg has read *non* where he should have read *No*, and it is also true that he has based his interpretation on the word *non*, which seems to be a real case of basing the internal sense on a wrong word. But it is not correct to say, or imply, that in the "Arcana" Swedenborg has based any interpretation on this difference of reading, for he does not there give the internal sense of the clause in which the mistake occurs.

7. In "Apocalypse Explained," n. 163[5], we read "*lectus*, a bed"; but in other places where the equivalent of the same Hebrew word is given, we read "*lectus*, separate from, or a Nazirite."

This is a famous and very interesting case, and deserves a full statement. In the blessing of Joseph by his father Israel, in GENESIS xlix, there occur in verse 26 the words, "the blessings of thy father . . . shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separated from his brethren;" and in the blessing of Joseph by Moses in DEUTERONOMY xxxiii, 16, these words are repeated. Now in both of these passages the word "separate" is in the Hebrew *Nazir*, which means consecrated, separated, and also, especially, a Nazirite. This last is the rendering made by Swedenborg in both these passages, namely, "the Nazirite of his brethren" (see Arcana, nn. 3969[6], 6437, and Apocalypse Explained, n. 448[6]). In the Writings proper these are all the instances where Swedenborg translates these two passages, so that in his published works he was quite consistent in this respect. Not so Schmidius, for in the Genesis passage he rendered *Nazir* by the Latin word *lectus*, a participle of the Latin verb *legere*, which means to choose; whereas in the Deuteronomy passage he rendered it by *Nazir*, and by this double rendering of the same word he led Swedenborg astray when he was writing his preparatory work on the "Apocalypse"; for it seems probable that in a moment of inadvertence he then saw the word *lectus* in his Latin Bible, took it to be the very different word *lectus* a bed, and thus was led to give the internal sense of what was *in this connection* the wrong word. It should, however, be borne in mind that Swedenborg was here unfolding the internal sense of the words, "Behold I will cast her into a bed," said of Jezebel in REVELATION ii, 22, where "bed" signifies doctrine; and in order to illustrate this signification Swedenborg quotes incidentally nine other passages of the Word and unfolds their internal sense, and among these the passage in question from GENESIS xlix. Bearing all these facts in mind, and also the

fact that Swedenborg never published this mistake, it will I think be admitted by every candid mind that this mistake, in itself a bad one, really amounts to very little, and that it is to be regarded merely as one of those exceptions that prove the rule, which in this connection is the marvelous accuracy and trustworthiness of Swedenborg as an instrument in the Lord's hands for revealing the internal sense of the Word.

8. In "Arcana," n. 3901, and again in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 780[8], the word *aquilæ*, eagles, occurs as the translation of a word elsewhere correctly translated by *pardi*, leopards.

In this instance Swedenborg evidently read *nesherim*, "eagles," where the Hebrew is *namerim*, "leopards," for as spelled in the Hebrew there is a difference of only one letter, and the two words look very much alike; and besides this the Hebrew word for an eagle really does occur in the same connection, and as quoted by Swedenborg in "Arcana," n. 3901[7], it stands in the very next line, so that he here makes the word "eagle" occur twice in the quotation, and the interpretation he gives is quite correct as applied to the second occurrence of this word, although it is not accurate if we apply it to its first occurrence when taken alone, where he ought to have read "leopards." The internal sense that he here gives is as follows: "in these places by 'eagles' is signified falsities induced by reasonings." Now a "leopard" signifies truth falsified, and an "eagle" in a bad sense signifies the reasoning which leads to falsities, which is a very similar signification to that of a leopard, the one being the cause and the other the effect of this cause; and when we remember that Swedenborg is not here giving a formal exposition of the internal sense of the prophet Habakkuk, but has merely quoted from this prophet in a general and abbreviated form the long verse in question, and also that he has quoted it to confirm the signification of "eagles," and by no means that of "leopards," it is surely going too far to say without any qualification that he has here written a wrong word, and has apparently based an interpretation upon it. And the same remark applies to the interpre-

tation given in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 780[8]. Dr. S. H. Worcester regarded this slip as being so trivial that he corrected the text in this place without any explanation in his Notes at the end of the volume.

9. Mr. Conant's ninth item calls attention to the substitution of the word *hædi*, kids, for *hirci*, goats, in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 650 [46, 47].

This is a mere reading of *hædos* "kids," instead of *hircos* "goats," and it is a mistake to say that an interpretation is apparently based on this very slight slip, as a reference to the two passages in question will show. If in regard to this difficulty Mr. Conant had said that on this basis apparently an interpretation is *not* made, he would have presented an accurate statement of the truth.

10. *Ebenum*, ebony, is found instead of *eburneum* or *eboreus*, ivory, in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 253[e].

In this instance Swedenborg by a slip of the pen wrote *ebenum* "ebony," instead of *eburneum* "ivory"; but that he *thought* of ivory is evident from the fact that he gave the internal sense correctly, namely, Divine truth in ultimates. Mr. Conant is therefore, once more mistaken in saying that Swedenborg has apparently made an interpretation on a wrong basis. Swedenborg really based his interpretation on "ivory," although by a mere slip he wrote the word for "ebony," In view of the great similarity of these two words in the Latin, this is an extremely small difficulty, and is not worth mentioning except in so far as it shows that Swedenborg's pen was not controlled in every stroke it made by the hand of Him who alone is infallible, which is of course the fact.

11. In "Arcana," n. 9643, we read *urbis*, city, where *orbis*, world, should have occurred.

Here Swedenborg wrote *urbis* "a city," instead of *orbis* "the world," and it is true that he based his interpretation accordingly, saying that a "city" denotes the doctrine of truth, an giving seven references to other places in the Writings whe r the signification of a city is stated. Here then we have a clear

case of Swedenborg's basing the internal sense on a wrong word. Now let us see what this mistake amounts to in its practical results. The correct reading of these words in the eighteenth Psalm is "the foundations of the world were overturned," and Swedenborg has written "the foundations of the city were overturned." In the internal sense "the world" signifies the Church, and "a city" signifies doctrine, here true doctrine, or the doctrine of truth. Therefore the correct internal sense would be that all things of the Church were overturned from the foundation (Apocalypse Explained, n. 741[22]). And by mistake Swedenborg changed this to, "all things of the doctrine of truth were overturned," which is of course an inadequate statement of the case, true as far as it goes, but not a statement of the whole truth, for it limits the overturning to the *doctrine* of the Church, whereas the fact is that not only the doctrine of the Church, but also everything else that belongs to the Church was thus overturned and destroyed. Moreover, Swedenborg not only made this mistake when writing the "Arcana," but also published it in print, and the mistake stands there against him forever. Admitting this, what does it prove? Merely the fact that as a writer and revealer of the internal sense of the Word he was not infallible. And by inference it proves also that the Lord did not intend him to be infallible; for which He must have had a good reason. What is this reason? Evidently to compel us to "enter *with understanding* into the arcana of faith," and not to swallow them down untasted, unmasticated, and consequently undigested. The shallow thinker does not desire to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Divine truths of Revelation, but prefers merely to open his mouth and allow some one else to pour them down his throat; for this he supposes to be the easiest way to receive instruction. To receive the knowledges of Divine truth in this way is very well for children and those who are naturally unable to use their rational faculty; but it is not for the intelligent, and still less for the wise, and least of all for the members of the Lord's New Church.

12. The Latin equivalent of part of the Greek of REVELATION xx, 6, is *in resurrectione prima*, and in several places Swedenborg has given this rendering; but he has elsewhere spoken of a *resurrectio secunda*.

In this case Mr. Conant has not stated any difficulty, or any mistake of Swedenborg; but I suppose his difficulty to consist in the fact that Swedenborg has so often mentioned a second resurrection, whereas only a first one is mentioned in the Word. Yet he must admit that the mention of a first resurrection does really imply in the letter the existence of at least one resurrection more, and so Swedenborg very naturally thought until the full internal sense of the expression "first resurrection" was made known to him. This is a very interesting subject, and thanks are due to Mr. Conant for calling attention to it. A thorough study of all the places in the Writings here referred to shows in the first place that Mr. Conant has made a good many mistakes in his references. Out of fifteen places where he says that Swedenborg mentions a second resurrection, I can find only twelve; and in two of these where Mr. Conant says that an interpretation is based on Swedenborg's mention of a second resurrection, I can find only one. And further, with regard to the last two references he gives, only one is really such, the first being taken from the Contents or Summary at the head of the chapter in the "Apocalypse Revealed" that contains the spiritual meaning here referred to.

In the second place, a thorough study of the remaining references brings to light a most interesting example of the way in which Swedenborg arrived step by step at a full and complete understanding of the internal sense of a given passage or expression. Let us trace this development through the references in question. The first two of these are "Adversaria," nn. 2/1380 and 2/1405, where Swedenborg writes that the second resurrection takes place at the Last Judgment, when all men will rise from their graves. This seems to mean that the first resurrection is that of our spirits, and the second is that of our natural bodies. But in "Spiritual Diary," n. 674, the first

resurrection is said to be for those who are in the interior Heaven, in whom the natural is joined into the spiritual; and it seems to be implied that the second resurrection is for those who are in a still more interior Heaven, who must put off the natural altogether (n. 675); so that a real spiritual sense is here given to the term "resurrection."

The same kind of a meaning is given in "Apocalypse Explained," at the end of n. 430, where it is said that those who are of the first resurrection are meant by the one hundred and forty-four thousand of the sealed, who were taken up into Heaven before the Judgment; and that all the others are meant by those who are of the second resurrection.

But in "Spiritual Diary," n. 4891, and also in nn. 5203, 5761, and 5763, and also in "Last Judgment," n. 59, it is said that those of the first resurrection are those who had lived in the primitive and next following times of the First Christian Church, and who had been good; and that the second resurrection is the resurrection of those who live in the latter times of the Church, and who are evil. This is a third view of the subject, and it is made memorable by the fact that in this case the meaning of the terms first and second resurrection is given in one of the works that were published by Swedenborg himself, namely, the "Last Judgment."

We come now to Swedenborg's final position on this subject, which is contained in n. 851 of the "Apocalypse Revealed," published by Swedenborg in 1766, and thus eight years after he published the "Last Judgment." Here, in his revelation of the internal sense of the "Apocalypse," verse by verse and clause by clause, Swedenborg speaks as follows. "This is the first resurrection. . . . The 'first' does not mean a first resurrection, but the very and primary thing of resurrection, thus salvation and eternal life; for there is only one resurrection to life; there is no second one, and therefore there is no mention of a second resurrection." And further in n. 852: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection. . . . By the first resurrection is signified elevation into Heaven by the

Lord, and thus salvation." And so with the "second death." . . . "He who does not observe that a first death is nowhere mentioned in the Apocalypse can easily believe that there are two spiritual deaths, . . . although there is only one spiritual death, which is here meant by the second death; and in like manner that there are two resurrections, because the first resurrection is mentioned, although there is only one resurrection, and therefore a second resurrection is nowhere mentioned." (n. 853.)

13. In "Apocalypse Explained," nn. 149, 151, we find *filius hominis*, where the correct reading would have been *filius Dei*.

It is true that in this instance Swedenborg wrote in a work never published by him "Son of man" instead of "Son of God;" but even here he stated the internal sense correctly, namely, "The Lord as to the Divine Human." And in the "Apocalypse Revealed," *in loco*, he quotes the phrase correctly — "Son of God." All this shows that the mistake in question was a mere slip of the pen, which he would in all probability have corrected if he had published the fragmentary work in which it occurs, and had been called upon to read the proofs of it, especially as in the same connection he had already quoted the expression "Son of God" correctly, namely, in the preliminary statement of the whole chapter at the head of his exposition of it, and again in the summary of the clauses and the internal sense of these in n. 149.

14. In "Apocalypse Explained," nn. 111, 118, the words *sed dives es* are explained; but in "Apocalypse Revealed" they are not given as part of the Word.

This instance goes to show that when Swedenborg was writing the "Apocalypse Explained" he regarded the words in question as a part of the text of Scripture, but that when eight years afterward he published the "Apocalypse Revealed" he was in doubt as to their authenticity in consequence of having received further information about the matter; and he therefore now says that these words are added in a parenthesis be-

cause they have been omitted in some codices. Although the use of the parenthesis was a frequent usage with Swedenborg, his printers very seldom marked it in the usual way by curved brackets, and the parenthesis in question is not so marked in Swedenborg's own edition of the "Apocalypse Revealed" that was published in the city of Amsterdam in 1766. In grappling with the difficulty caused by the giving of an internal sense to words that were afterward found to be of doubtful authenticity, Dr. Rudolph L. Tafel, in his work entitled "Authority in the New Church," on page 260, says that as the Apostle John wrote to the seven Churches (REV. i, 4), he must have written seven letters, and that these are the codices in question; and further that as Swedenborg states that he met this beloved Apostle in the spiritual world, he it was who informed Swedenborg of this variation in his letters. However this may be, it really does seem not unlikely that Swedenborg received instruction about these codices from some spiritual source, seeing that the words in question exist in all the known codices of the New Testament, and it is highly improbable that Swedenborg himself discovered in this world a number of codices which do not contain these words.

15. In "Apocalypse Explained," n. 405^{32}, occurs the word *lux*, though the Greek requires *urbs*.

This is another instance of a slip of the pen in a work not published by Swedenborg. Instead of writing "a city that is set on a mountain cannot be hid," he wrote "a light that is set on a mountain." The word "light" had just occurred in the phrase, "Ye are the light of the world," and he no doubt had the word in his eye, and wrote it again where he should not have done so. But the internal sense is not vitiated, for it is given as being "truth from good," and that this is the correct internal sense of the words "a *city* set on a mountain" can be seen in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 223^{18}, where also Swedenborg quotes this passage, and without any slip of the pen gives what is practically the same internal sense.

JOHN F. POTTS.

SWEDENBORG AND THE DRAMA.

THE subject of Swedenborg and the Drama is in one aspect very large and fundamental in our denominational position. From this point of view it will be possible for us to treat it only in the most general way. From another point of view it is smaller, and appeals to our more immediate interests. On this side it will perhaps be possible for us to reach some direct conclusions.

In its larger aspect, the idea of drama underlies Swedenborg's whole system of theology and philosophy. We may refer to it thus as Swedenborg's system for the convenience of giving it a name. We really mean, of course, the inspired system which he was specially allowed to study in its sources, and explain to us.

Let us try to see what we mean by drama, and what are its manifestations. Drama may be said to be the fullest expression possible, on the physical plane, of what goes on upon the plane of the soul. The musician may express in his work love or hate, but he can get the expression to us only through the one gateway to the soul, that of hearing. The painter is similarly limited by the appeal to one sense only, that of sight; he is further conditioned, moreover, by having but one plane of this sense open to him, the flat surface of the picture. The sculptor, too, can use only that one gateway; but having to work with the round as well as the flat, he can reach us from many points of view. The dramatist is the least encumbered in his presentation, making up for the lack of permanence in his work by this greater area of appeal. He reaches our souls more or less through their every gateway, — sight, hearing, and such a vivid use of suggestions of touch, scent and even taste, as makes the onlooker seem at least to exercise all these senses at the same time as the actor. The dramatist has also at command motion, which gives to his picture the variety and constant change of natural life.

This dramatic method of expression is not confined to art. It characterizes our whole life and environment. It begins in infancy. The little baby cannot tell its mother of its love. But it makes some inarticulate sound which its mother is sure she can interpret; it smiles, it changes its attitude, it holds out its little arms, it clutches and holds on with evident satisfaction. And why? We cannot tell absolutely; but we can hardly fail to believe that it is trying to express outwardly something within its soul, to dramatize its love for its mother, — the simplest form, as we believe, of the highest and purest love of which the human being is capable. As we get older, life becomes a constant effort to express outwardly, with even greater precision, what is going on within. Our childish likes and dislikes of persons are enlarged to include also likes and dislikes of various forms of activity, work and play, the effort to get or to give, and innumerable combinations of all of these interests. We express all this that is going on within us either frankly or by dissimulation; but express we must, and so doing we avail ourselves consciously or otherwise of every resource of the dramatist, — speech, act, things gathered around us and arranged for definite effects, locations in town or country in the midst of the works which come most directly from the hand of God in nature, or in those which come the least directly, in every contrivance manufactured by man.

The drama as an art in the strict sense is nothing but a selection from this larger drama of life arranged naturally, or re-arranged more or less artificially, to re-present as we say, human life, either in fact or in grotesque imitation. In this effort to select and re-present what is going on within the phenomena of life, the dramatist and the actor work together; sometimes they are the same person. And the two great schools of acting are but two methods with the same end in view. The one school, of which we may choose the late Sir Henry Irving as a representative, aims to feel and understand the inner soul-action to be portrayed; but having thus once actually experienced it, the method aims to get the actor right above that

experience, from which vantage ground he may direct his body and all his accessory resources to present the feeling and the experience most perfectly to the onlooker. The other school, of which perhaps Madame Duse or Madame Bernhardt are representatives — the school is rather Latin than English, — aims at having the actor feel and understand afresh again and again, right before the onlooker, the inner life he or she is aiming to express, and to carry the onlooker along with the actor by the intensity of the latter's realizations. In both schools it is to be observed the dramatizer of the inner experience, must have, at least once, in fact or imagination, identified himself with the state to be re-presented.

The schools of dramatic writing have varied similarly according as they deliberately aim at identifying the actor with what he represents either wholly, as a complete living human being, or partially, as more or less of a mere mouth-piece of human life in general. Shakespeare's characters are almost wholly of the latter class. The story of Othello's jealousy might just as well be represented as occurring in Boston or New York or London as in Venice, if the language and costumes were adapted. The great glory of Shakespeare is doubtless his ability to reach into the real depths of the human soul for his themes. Having got his theme, he seems to dress it up almost at haphazard,—often in other clothes and plots, very often anachronistic, the only purpose apparently to give it external charm and beauty. In short he dips into two different parts of the drama of life, — its great issues, on the one side, and its romantic exterior, on the other, — and puts them forcibly together, for the most part at his own sweet will. Our modern school tries to select both the inner and the outer, from the same place in life, — the place where they would be most likely to be found together. The great originator of the modern school is almost without question Henrik Ibsen, Norwegian by birth, cosmopolitan by the adoption of most of our civilized world. In his work every accessory has its place in the whole effect; and in all his best work, the place is the one we feel most natural to the theme

discussed. In general then, the variant schools of dramatists, like the different schools of acting, are but different methods for the same end, namely, to select for profit, for amusement, for edification, or what not, from life, its inner and its outer movements, the action of the human spirit upon its environment, and re-present them; and neither dramatist nor actor would exist in the world of art, were we not, everyone of us, in the facts of life, both dramatist and actor, trying according to our lights to bring our souls into evidence, in our bodies and in all our outward concerns.

Now always, but not always with equal clearness, it has seemed to human beings that their soul-life is presented and re-presented to their view not only in their own animate actions, but also in their more or less inanimate environment. Human beings seem always to have felt this, from the time of the very earliest records of any human feelings whatsoever. Their poets have put the feeling into words. We have seemed to see and feel our human feelings interpreted, expressed, dramatized, in all the rest of creation. The lion thus 'expresses' our human sense of power; the fox of cunning; and so forth. The vegetable world has 'expressed' noble or degraded growths in human living. The diamond has seemed to scintillate like a brilliant mind; the ruby and carbuncle to glow like a warm fire and a warm heart. The day 'expresses' cheeriness when bright, and gloominess when dull. Every figure that we thus apply to creation outside of us, means that we regard it, as we so often say, as a theatre, expressing, representing, in some form, the inner life of the human soul.

Very early in our human history the question arose, how it happened that human life was thus represented. And, in the earliest times of history, out of the instinct to idealize and personify, the answer seems to have been given that it was not our ordinary, commonplace human nature that was thus represented, but, in every case, the nature of a god, — a god very naively conceived, very little but still a little more than human. A god's love for human beings was represented in the fertility

of the earth in general, and in particular in the sunshine, the flowers, more especially the fruits, and in all the rest of what were regarded as the kindly efforts of nature and of animal life; similarly a god's hate was represented in the malignant elements of the human environment. The earliest recorded human efforts in dramatic composition were the efforts to re-present in dramatic form, that is, to select from fact as they saw it, the salient features, such as would show how this occurred. This was the beginning of drama amongst the Greeks in the festivals of the god Dionysos. Whether, as our doctrines teach, this was a degenerate revival of an earlier and clearer conception of God, or, as is the materialistic view, a human invention on the basis of an instinct, need not here concern us. The fact remains that our environment was supposed to be the drama of an idealized human soul in the process of outward expression. When therefore the idea of God in human life was clarified and ennobled by gentile Christianity on its old Hebrew basis, the idea of God's self-expression in nature, was to a great extent forgotten, in the more personal idea of His specific operation in the drama of Hebrew history, which the Old Testament claimed to re-present, and, in early Christian history, in the divine life on earth presented in that of the Christ. The effort to select from this life-drama for the re-presented drama of the stage, led to the miracle plays, of which that at Oberammagau, "Everyman," and others more recently revived, are our present-day survivals. The drama in its progress from these mediæval sources to the present day, has come down to earth again. Instead of selecting for representation the idealized human life as it is in God and His direct operations, it chose more earthly human affairs and the soul-life which lies most immediately behind these, and the secular drama of to-day is the result.

Now Swedenborg, for his complete philosophy of life, either outspokenly or by implication, gathers up the results of all these different dramatic efforts in history; first, our own past and present experience which is trying ever to re-present dra-

matically what is going on in our own souls; and, second, that which had been lost sight of by the dramatists but retained by the poets, the idea that our whole environment, the whole extra-human creation, is a veritable representation of our human nature idealized, divinized, made representative of the nature of God. For Swedenborg's philosophy, put in modern philosophic terms, may be said to be that the ultimate reality is a divinely-human God, presenting to human life His nature, and continually re-presenting it, by the finiting of His infinity through innumerable degrees, in the soul-life of humanity, and in all the infinitely varied forms of creation, the phenomenal aspects of which are but outward correspondents of His life, more or less removed in degree from Him as He is in Himself; so that all our human experiences, of life within and of life outside us, are but partial, transient forms of the complete, personal, individual and ultimate experience, which is God. Human life then is the drama, the outward expression by living moving beings, of God's action upon man, from which of course selections may be made into composed drama for representation for any specific end. Nature is a different, less direct form of one and the same drama, and we may see the drama there and represent it to ourselves to some extent, led by Swedenborg's doctrine, by which the correspondence of the phenomenal to the real may be understood. Thus then may we say that this sense of drama is as we premised, the basis of Swedenborg's philosophy.

It is similarly the basis of his religious teaching. For him, the perfect, divinely-human life which is God was dramatized, presented outwardly by a living human being in the life of the Christ. The Christ was the full Impersonator of the life of God, so far as that infinite life could be finited and impersonated in a human being, in human circumstances. Only by degrees did the Impersonator become absolutely one with the Being impersonated. It is the idea of the perfection of the representation in human terms of the Divine nature that lay within the outer nature of the Christ, and the idea of separated

consciousness when, in states of exinanition, the representation was most difficult, and of identity of consciousness in states of exaltation, that form the very basis of Swedenborg's religious system. They give us the Christ as very Man and very God, able to be in our life and at the same time above it, leading us ever from the phenomenal life of the body to the real best life of the soul. And the idea of representation is carried throughout the system. We see our own nature represented in human perfection, the mirror of divine perfection, the most directly in the Christ. But all life around us becomes also a drama in which, when enlightened, we may see represented the operation of the Providence of the divinely-human nature over and around the merely human; and the true explanation of human experience, and the ability to read its lessons and profit by them, is conditioned by our ability to see and appreciate this drama of the Real Life about us. More than that, the unity of the self-representation of the divine Being enables us also, when enlightened, to see our life, both in fact and in ideal, represented in the whole of nature, where it is held up both in its bad and its good elements for our edification.

And further still: such is the unity of all life, Divine and human, with nature, and with providence in all human and national affairs, that all history in its varied setting becomes a drama, constantly repeating itself, and always representing to the enlightened philosopher of history the operation of the divine upon the human nature; so that, when certain typical events in that story are divinely selected, put in their properly related natural environment, and composed under the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they become the standard drama of human life, in which every variety of human experience is represented, together with God's ideal dealing with that experience; such that we can go to it in all circumstances, of joy and sorrow, of failure and triumph, and see there played out in detail, by persons and by their environment, how we ought to act in circumstances similar to those the great drama depicts. Here then we may be taught of God indeed, not in abstract

precepts, but in actual human scenes, in which people like ourselves love, think, and act, both obediently and disobediently to God, receiving, as we may also, His blessings or His reproofs. It is the teaching of Swedenborg as to the ability of the Divine thus truly to represent Himself and His nature, both in the facts of human life and in the inspired record of those facts, that justifies us in regarding the Scriptures as the Holy Word of God.

The subject is, then, as we saw, a very large one in its many implications. We should have to go into this matter very deeply to see in detail how this principle of self-representation underlies both the philosophic and the religious system for which we are indebted to Swedenborg.

Turning now to the smaller aspect of the matter, the direct relation of Swedenborg or his teachings to the drama in the strict sense of composed works for the stage, we find ourselves upon more familiar ground.

Swedenborg's personal interest in the theatre would seem to have started, when, after graduation from the university, he began going upon his foreign tours in England, France, Holland, Germany, and Italy. His correspondence records his attendance at theatres and opera-houses especially in France and Italy. One of his very definite notes records, for example, that "the best harlequins come from Bergamo." That reminds us of the period of dramatic history in which Swedenborg was then living. Opera was in one of its lowest forms, the so-called oratorio-opera, in which the dramatic element was almost wholly absent, replaced by a religious, sentimental or comic solo-declamation. The leading composers were Italians, of whom we never hear nowadays, Carissimi and Cesti; and later the great writer of oratorio, worthily unsuccessful in the then debased form of opera, Handel. In the spoken drama Swedenborg would likely see in France the works of Corneille, Racine and perhaps Molière, the historical, social or satiric drama, in which the actors are for the most part puppets to express the author's own comments upon life, not often to rep-

resent the actual outward life, still less the inner life of the day. Swedenborg's comments are very scarce. We gather at least that in this, as in all the outward affairs of life, his tastes were catholic; that he was no less interested in the representation of human life on the stage, than in actuality about him. This practical human life was, we know, his constant study, always with the aim to be of service to it. It is almost certainly due to his breadth of view that we as a denomination have never, like some other Christian bodies about us, been shy of worthy dramatic representations. His early interest may be to some slight extent responsible for the place he gives to dramatic representation in his post-illumination, theological works. This should perhaps be remembered in dealing for instance, with such works as "Heaven and Hell." Swedenborg does not attempt to give us a complete description of heaven. To do so, as he says, would be impossible in human terms. Doubtless all that he says of heaven is true; but it is not and does not claim to be the whole truth. His previous interests then possibly had taken part in guiding him to what we may call, perhaps without irreverence, the court circles of the heavens, as also, most certainly to the circles of scholarly disquisition. Whether our interests will guide all of us to just these circles is perhaps matter for question. It is certainly to the breadth of our seer's earthly experience, that we are indebted for the very wide area of information about heaven which he does cover. Prominent here is the place given to dramatic representation, — doubtless another reason for our denominational attitude in the matter. If the preparation and representation of plays is worthy of heaven, it is surely so also of earth.

You may recall the place it occupies in the education of children in heaven:—

> Little children are instructed principally by representatives suited to their capacity. How beautiful these are and how full of wisdom from within, no one can believe. In this way intelligence is imparted to them, by degrees, which derives its soul from good. Two representatives granted me to see, I may here describe, from which the nature of others may be

inferred. First, angels represented the Lord rising from the sepulchre, and at the same time the uniting of His Human with the Divine; which was done in a manner so wise as to exceed all human wisdom, and at the same time in an innocent, infantile manner. They also presented an idea of a sepulchre, but not at the same time an idea of the Lord, except so remotely that it was scarcely perceived that it was the Lord, and only as it were from afar; because in the idea of a sepulchre there is something funereal, which they thus removed. Afterward they cautiously admitted into the sepulchre something atmospheric, yet appearing like very pure water, by which they signified, also with becoming remoteness, spiritual life in baptism. Afterward I saw represented by them the descent of the Lord to the bound, and His ascent with the bound into heaven, and this with incomparable prudence and piety; and, what was infantile, they let down little cords, almost invisible, very soft and tender, by which they raised up the Lord in His ascent — always in holy fear lest anything in the representative should border upon anything in which there was not what is spiritual and heavenly. To these were added other representatives such as are presented to the children, and by which they are brought into knowledges of truth and affections for good, as by plays suitable to infant minds. (Heaven and Hell, n. 335.)

Just what is meant by "plays suitable to infant minds" is a question. It may be like the mother-plays of Frœbel and Pestalozzi, of whom it has often been claimed that they drew inspiration from Swedenborg. But of those described in the earlier part of the paragraph, there can be no question. They are like the miracle plays of mediævalism, purified and adapted to the subject to be taught, and to the little pupils.

But such dramatic representation in heaven is not confined to the children. In the well-known memorable relation in the "True Christian Religion," repeated in the work on "Conjugial Love," in which is given a general description of daily affairs in a heavenly society, occurs the following: —

"Outside the city there are also spectacular entertainments by players on the stage, representing the various virtues and excellencies of the moral life — among whom are actors of lower parts, for the sake of comparison."

One of the ten asked, "Why for comparison?"

They answered, "No one of the virtues can be presented in its grace and excellence, to the life, except by comparisons, from the greatest of them to

the least, until they become none. But it is established by law that nothing of the opposite shall be exhibited which might be called dishonorable or unseemly, unless by metaphor and as it were remotely. The reason why it is so established is that no excellence or good, of any virtue, passes by successive degrees down to what is dishonorable and evil; but only to its least, until it vanishes, — and when it comes to none the opposite begins. And therefore heaven, where all things are good and honorable, has nothing in common with hell, where all things are dishonorable and evil." (Conjugial Love, n. 17.)

From both these extracts it is plain that dramatic representation is used in heaven for education, to attract one to the imitation of the Lord, or to the pleasures of Christian virtue. That is a great suggestion for the theory of education on earth, a suggestion already taken advantage of in the kindergarten and in the historical education of adults through the revival of pageants, here and abroad. The principle should undoubtedly be carried through all stages of the educational process. The quotation certainly contains a great principle, one which we may perhaps call Swedenborg's special principle for the guidance of our relation to dramatic representation on earth. He would seem to teach that it must be educative. And in view of other teachings we may interpret the term in its root-sense to mean that which "leads out" from within us, by precept and example, the best that is there, anything that has been put there by our divine-human heavenly Father, anything that is truly and really human in the life of earth. Anything which re-presents worthy human life then, is good dramatic art. It must be represented doubtless as Swedenborg says of heaven "by comparisons." The comparisons then must not be so strong a contrast in evil as to leave our minds there; neither must they be so ludicrous as to lose all semblance of the truly human and thus insult the human form divine. But within those limits all plays may be truly educative, because showing us, in mirror, by appeal through all our senses, what we are and what we might be. And the acting of them by those with any skill may be even more educative than the mere witnessing. To try to see things through the eyes and experiences of other men is the

very best teacher of neighborly love, whether on the stage of the theatre or on that of life. And within the limits of the worthy and educative representation of life come almost all the plays which the best taste of the day recognizes as good; from tragedy to farce; from the truly historical and semi-historical plays of Shakespeare with their rich insight and attractive if arbitrarily composed settings, to the greater problem-plays of Ibsen and his followers, Pinero and the modern dramatists; especially perhaps our most modern plays with a purpose, like Mr. Robertson's latest production. It goes without saying that all, being of human composition, will have imperfections, offenses to taste and the worthy reproduction of the truly human, which have no parallel in the plays of heaven. The extent to which we may overlook such imperfections for the sake of the good in the drama, is a problem which each auditor must settle for himself.

The recent revival of miracle plays, the introduction of them even into our own Sunday-schools, the modern interest in symbolic plays like "Chanticlère" and Maeterlinck's "Blue Bird," and in what we may call modern moralities, like "The Passing of the Third Floor Back," raises a question which perhaps we may briefly consider. To what extent should the church, and the New Church especially, try to use the stage in its efforts for religious training and education? At least let us dismiss from our minds all fear that there is necessarily harm in the effort. Miss Elsie Hobart's little plays for Christmas and Easter, reproduced in so many of our Sunday-schools, should show that nothing but good can come of such an effort wisely directed. We may go further. The recent great success of what we have called the modern morality play should surely inspire some dramatic genius in our own denomination to give to the great light-upon-life which we believe we possess, the enormous appeal which it would have if represented upon the stage. That it can be so represented is proved by the fact that unconsciously or not, such light has been actually embodied in some of these modern plays.

The "Message from Mars," which had such great success a few years back, was almost a sermon upon Swedenborg's great root of all evil, selfishness. The doctrine of the immanence of God in providence, and His reaching thus into the least affairs of life, may be said to be the foundation of the very beautiful dramatization of Mrs. Hodgson Burnett's "Dawn of a To-morrow." It includes you may remember a most attractive treatment of the doctrines of a loving God, and of faith, as something more than of the head, rather of the enlightened heart and hand, in the most difficult earthly conditions, and for all, especially the simple good.

Again Swedenborg's great protest against the lust of dominion in the clergy and his insistence that the minister is both to teach and to lead the way to heaven through actual service, may be said to be the foundation of that attractive but somewhat unfortunate mixture of mysticism and dramatic force, Mr. Kennedy's "The Servant in the House." Swedenborg's explicit treatment of the church universal, as, in the sight of the Lord, one man, of many greater and less members, is probably the real motif of the play; not quite consciously realized perhaps, but well summed up in the great speech of the second act, the building of the mystical church. It is interesting to compare it with a description in Swedenborg's "True Christian Religion," n. 119.

But the play which most obviously depends upon one of Swedenborg's most unique doctrines for its whole point is the dramatization of Mr. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back." It is impossible to witness it without seeing that it is simply a succession of illustrations of the doctrine of Remains. Almost every one of the unfortunate people whom the stranger converts is appealed to on the ground either of what parents thought and hoped for in them, or what they planned and the ideals they conceived in younger days. It is interesting to note that this idea comes out but little in the story. But when it is necessary to enlarge the scale of the work and make it more clear in motive and expression, as always has to be done

for the stage, the real basis seems to be instinctively recognized by the author and used to its limits.

When we see the specific doctrines of our Church thus dramatized and reaching in the most attractive form the enormous audiences that a long run of a play commands, it may well make us wish we could unearth some real talent for this work in our denomination.

In regard to the organized drama of the stage, then, we may conclude that the interest of Swedenborg in it as a young man had its influence upon the teachings of his illumination. These show at least the educational value of the dramatic representation of the principles of life, a value admirably adopted already by the kindergarten, and used for teaching history through pageants, and yet, it is hoped, to be further adopted in higher education. And when we see the same method also used for teaching morals and perhaps real doctrines of a true Christianity, we must admit for our information and perhaps for the practical development of a dramatic spirit within our own borders, that the drama has a place in the practical work of our denomination, as it has a vital place in the self-representation of God which is the basis of the religion and the philosophy of our Church.

CHARLES W. HARVEY.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

EASTER AND THE LORD'S BODY.

EASTER celebrates the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. Its observance is becoming more extensive every year. What does it mean? Is it because there is an increasing belief in the life after death and an increasing faith in Him as the "Resurrection and the Life"?

The Christian Church began with the preaching of the gospel of the Lord's resurrection. Paul summed it up logically when he said, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (1 COR. xv, 13, 14). The Lord had been rejected and crucified as a blasphemous imposter. His vindication before the world rested upon His resurrection and continued power with His disciples. His disciples could never have taken up His work and gone on with it had He not risen from the dead and filled them with His Holy Spirit and made them His apostles and fulfilled His promise, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen" (MATT. xxviii, 20). This is that which distinguishes Christianity, first of all, from every other religion of the earth: it has a definite doctrine of the resurrection and a Divine example of it; indeed, it has brought the doctrine of the resurrection, as has been noted by a recent writer in Hasting's Bible Dictionary, "from the background of religious thought to the very front." It has given to the Lord a kingdom which is not of this world, and one which shall endure forever. His Divinity and His Lordship over men, and therefore His entire Gospel, are thus made to rest upon the fact of His resurrection. Accept this fact and the way is opened to receive all the rest of the Christian Gospel — the redemption of men, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal life.

It is interesting to note in passing that some modern leaders of Christian thought, who are finding difficulty with the Gospel doc-

trine of the miraculous conception of the Lord in the light of natural science, and are disposed to make the virgin birth non-essential as a matter of doctrinal belief, are in no such attitude towards the resurrection. A notable instance of this is in Dr. George A. Gordon's last book, "Religion and Miracle." After expressing a willingness to believe that the Divine incarnation could be just as complete if Joseph was the father of Jesus, he writes: —

> When we come to the resurrection of Jesus, we come to that which is central in the gospel; apostolic faith and service begin here. There is only one mind at this point among the leaders and teachers in the apostolic community. . . . Our Christian faith began with . . . those who were disciples and servants not of a dead, but of a living and reigning Christ. (p. 106.)

But he asks: —

> Is the bodily resurrection of Jesus essential to this faith? If the physical resurrection is denied in the name of natural law, does it follow that the spiritual resurrection must be unreal? The Gospels seem to describe a physical rising from the dead; Paul's vision of Jesus was spiritual. Which form of resurrection is the surer and mightier, that to which the Gospels bear testimony, or that of which Paul is the witness? (p. 107.)

The increasing observance of Easter, then, may mean that there is an increasing faith in the resurrection and in the risen Lord; and the doubt of the resurrection of His physical body may be regarded as an indication of the progress of the New-Church teaching, aided by the influence of natural science, that there is no resurrection of the material body, but of man in a spiritual body and world. There can be no doubt that the Jews of the Scriptures, so far as they believed in any resurrection of the dead, conceived of it only as a return to the enjoyment of material conditions. And it is doubtful if Christians ever could rise into more spiritual conceptions of what the resurrection means, without the second coming of the Lord to make His spiritual presence manifest and rational. It is true that nothing of the Lord's body was left in the tomb after He rose; and yet it was equally clear that the body with which He rose was not subject to the conditions of the material body that died on the cross, for it could pass through closed doors, and could be present without the usual interval of time in different and distant places, and it could be made visible to friends at the Lord's pleasure, but it was never seen by enemies, and there was something about it which made its recognition even by friends somewhat slow and difficult. Mary at first sup-

posed the gardener spoke to her when it was the Lord; two others walked along with Him on the way to Emmaus, and were permitted to know Him only in the blessing and breaking of bread, when immediately He vanished. Certainly His own resurrection body was very different from that of Lazarus who returned to his former material relations with his sisters and friends. But His disciples could not explain the difference, so they continued in the old Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh in some mysterious way; and the Christian Church has continued in it until now, when modern science makes it no longer tenable, and the New-Church doctrine of the resurrection of the spiritual body in the spiritual world seems more rational.

But while the doctrine of a spiritual resurrection gives a rational explanation to all other cases it is not satisfactory in this one, for it does not tell us what became of the Lord's earthly body. For a rational explanation of this we must go back to the Gospel account of the incarnation and accept its teaching of the virgin birth. Then we see that the Lord received by birth from the mother what all others receive from the mother, but what others receive from the father He received directly from God without the intervention of an earthly father. Ordinarily the seed, or life, from God is finited by the father and given to the mother to clothe in flesh; but in this instance Life Itself was clothed in a material form, God Himself became incarnate. But the process was not completed by birth; the Divine had to be brought into human expression, and into redeeming and saving contact with humanity in every earthly experience from the cradle to the grave. And this must mean that the Divine of the Father took the place of that which was from the mother step by step all the way to the cross, or else the Divine could not be made human and the incarnation could not be completed. We must remember that God was thus coming to men to live with them in all this process of incarnation, and that Mary had nothing Divine to contribute. She could only open a door, as it were, through her own mind and body; or provide a scaffolding which must be removed as fast as its use is accomplished. The result was a Divine-Human life with men which in its fullest ultimation was a Divine-Human Body. And this was, and is, the body which rose and appeared to His disciples that first glad Easter morning. Not a particle of it was from the virgin Mary; it was glorified and made entirely Divine.

The last of what was from Mary had perished on the cross and had been dissipated and returned to the elements in the air in the sepulchre, and God Himself came forth in His own Divine-Human form.

How the natural mind and body derived from Mary were dissipated and returned to their elements by the approach of the Divine, we are helped to understand by the following: —

> The Divine Itself is pure love, and pure love is as fire, more ardent than the fire of the sun of this world; if therefore the Divine love in its purity flowed into any angel, spirit, or man, he would altogether perish. Hence it is that Jehovah or the Lord in the Word is so often called a consuming fire. Lest therefore the angels in heaven should be hurt by the influx of heat from the Lord as a sun, they are each of them veiled by a certain thin and appropriate cloud, whereby the heat flowing in is tempered. . . . From this . . . it may be manifestly evident that the Lord's Human is Divine; for unless it were Divine, it could never be so united to the Divine Istelf, which is called the Father, as that they may be one . . . for what so receives the Divine must needs be altogether Divine; what is not Divine would be utterly dissipated by such a union. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6849.)

This, let us notice, explains what became of the broiled fish and the honey-comb which the Lord ate in the presence of His disciples after His resurrection, when His body was Divine and no longer had need of food, certainly not of material food; instead of being digested and assimilated, as when received into an earthly body, they were dissipated, or disintegrated, on approaching the Divine fire of the Lord's love, and returned to nature in this way instead of by the usual way of physiological combustion.

But why did He ask the disciples for such food then? Manifestly, to assure them that His resurrection was not like that of others — for the spiritual world only; but that it was for this world also — for the sake of continued Divine-Human relations of life with men on earth as well as with angels in heaven. Indeed, this was the purpose of all His post-resurrection appearings to His disciples, that men might be assured of His resurrection, not merely in the spiritual world like others, but also unlike all others in this world too. Hence His assurance at the end, saying, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (MATT. xxviii, 20). Of this we read: —

> The Lord made the very corporeal in Himself Divine, both its sensuous things and its recipients; wherefore also He rose again from the sepulchre with His body, and likewise after His resurrection said to His disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath

not flesh and bones as ye see me have" (LUKE xxiv, 39). No man rises again with the body with which he was encompassed (here); but the Lord alone (did so) because He made His body Divine while He was (here). (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5078.)

Hence we learn that this body, while it could thus be present with all things in this world, even to the lowest of the mineral kingdom, still was not material and subject to material limitations of earthly time and space; it was rather "Divine Natural" and "Divine Substantial" and could pass through closed doors, and could appear at pleasure to those in places at a distance from each other without the usual intervals of time required by earthly journeys. But it was substantial, nevertheless, and could be seen and handled; but by the opening of spiritual eyes and senses, not to the ordinary substances of the spiritual world, but to the finer and more potent substance of this Divine-Human Body, present now throughout all the planes of heaven and earth, but superior to them — indeed, the very life of them all; therefore His words, saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." (MATT. xxviii, 18.)

But because this body is Divine and one with the Father it is infinite (Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 3701; 4715[2]). How, then, can it be made to appear to finite men and angels? We answer, "Under the spiritual law of appearances and representatives." The realities of Divine and spiritual life are love and wisdom, internal things. How are they ever made to appear externally? The love and wisdom of the Lord is made to appear to the angels first of all, and constantly, as the sun of heaven, and as the warmth and light filling the atmospheres of heaven. The Lord is not in reality thus a sun: He is in reality the Divine and Infinite Man in whose image and likeness we are created; but His love and wisdom going forth to create are thus represented and made to appear objectively. It is a true and real appearance of an inward and real relation of the Lord's love and wisdom to the angels. The appearance corresponds to the reality. There is not the slightest illusion in it. So is it with all the realities of heaven; they are realities of the spirit made to appear in outward forms of expression in perfect correspondence with its inward condition. And so is it with the Lord's Divine Human in all respects except its infinity, which cannot be made to appear to finite perception either internally or externally; but the external appearance is in correspondence with the internal

perception of the angel or disciple who is blessed with the revelation of His Lord's personal presence. The presence of the infinite Divine-Human Body of the Lord is always with them whether in heaven or earth; but when the appearance of it is granted, either in the sun of the highest heavens, or a little out of it, or in another angel filled "by aspect," or in the newly risen Lord Himself ascending to the Father's throne, it is a real external appearance of a Divine-Substantial body in correspondence with an inward representation or perception of it. And this appearance is to the senses of the spiritual body of him who sees or feels it, or hears the voice of His Lord thus speaking to him. It is represented to him under the same spiritual law of appearances as is his own spiritual body and garments and all his environment. He can depend upon its reality and truthfulness in the one case just as much as in the other. The Lord's resurrection body is a real, substantial, abiding fact, all the more to be depended upon because it is Divine and infinite.

And because the Lord's glorified body is infinite it is uncreated. The Divine-Human, since it is one with the Divine, must be eternal. Nothing was added to the Infinite by the incarnation. There was no change in God by means of it; nothing was added to His love for us, no new knowledge entered into His omniscience, by His being tempted like as we are; and no increase of His omnipotence followed. The change was in humanity and in nature. A new way of approach and of reception was opened. In this sense God bowed the heavens and came down. He veiled Himself in the flesh of a body and nature taken by birth from Mary in order that no harm should come to His creatures and His creation from this new entrance into lower planes, even to the lowest, — that of the mineral kingdom. Otherwise the fire of His infinite love would have consumed them. Nevertheless, a new relation was established, bringing redemption to men by putting the hells in order and completing the planes of the heavens. His having a new access to us operates in giving us a new access to Him. The former internal relation to Him having been lost this new external one must be given or there would be none. And without a relation between God and man the human race would perish. If the internal relation had not been lost the new external relation by birth from a virgin would not have been necessary. We are taught that if the Most Ancient Church, which

is called Adam, "had remained in its integrity the Lord would have had no need of being born man" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2661). For we read further: —

The Divine is not susceptible of evil. And therefore, that He might conquer evil by His own powers — which no man was able to do, or can do — and so might alone become Justice, He was willing to be born as another man. If it had not been for this, there would have been no need of His being born; for the Lord could assume Human Essence without birth, as He did sometimes assume it, when seen by the Most Ancient Church, and likewise by the prophets. (*Ibid.*, n. 1573[7].)

God is Very Man. In all the heavens there is no other idea of God but the idea of a man; the cause is, that heaven in the whole and in the part is in form as a man, and the Divine, which is with the angels makes heaven; and thought goes according to the form of heaven; wherefore it is impossible for the angels to think of God otherwise. Hence it is that all those in the world who are conjoined with heaven, when they think inwardly in themselves or in their spirit, think in like manner of God. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 11.)

That the Lord was from eternity, is plainly evident from the Word (see n. 2803), although He was afterward born in time; for He spake by Moses and the Prophets; He likewise had appeared to many, and it was there said that He was Jehovah. But this deepest of arcana could be revealed to none but those who are in Divine perception and so to scarcely any but the men of the Most Ancient Church, who were celestial and in that perception. From these I have heard that Jehovah Himself was the Lord as to the Divine Human, when He descended into heaven, and flowed through heaven; for heaven represents one man as to all his members, and is therefore also called the Greatest Man. The Divine Itself in heaven, or in the Greatest Man, was the Divine Human, and was Jehovah Himself thus clothed with the Human. But when men became such that the Divine Itself, clothed as the Divine Human, could no longer affect them — that is, when Jehovah could no longer come to man, because man had so far removed himself — then Jehovah, Who is the Lord as to the Divine Essence, descended and took upon Himself a Human, by conception Divine, and by birth from a virgin such as that of another man; but this He expelled, and by Divine means made the Human that was born, Divine, from which proceeds all the Holy. Thus the Divine Human became an essence in Itself which fills the whole heaven, and which also makes it possible for those to be saved who could not be saved before. This now is the Lord, Who as to the Divine Human is alone Man, and from Whom man has it that he is man. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3061.)

It is well for us, who are far removed from the "Divine perception" enjoyed by the celestial men of the Most Ancient Church, to throw great emphasis upon the invisible Jehovah's becoming visible by the incarnation. Nothing can be stronger than the way in which this is taught in the "True Christian Religion," n. 786; but

it must be understood, in the light of the passages given above, to mean that it is a necessity to men who have lost the Lord's inward way of revealing Himself to them; and it must not lead us to suppose that a Divine Body has been created for the purpose, which did not exist before, and that the Lord can actually make Himself visible now in a way that He could not before. As we have seen the Divine process of the incarnation was but the descent into the lowest planes of creation of the Divine Human which had always existed in the Lord Himself, and which had already descended into the planes of the celestial and spiritual heavens. Of this we are taught as follows: —

> I have been told from heaven that in the Lord from eternity, Who is Jehovah, before the assumption of the Human in the world, there were the two prior degrees actually, and the third degree in potency, such as they are also with the angels; but that after the assumption of the Human in the world, He put on also the third degree, which is called the natural, and that thereby He became a man similar to man in the world, with the difference, however, that this degree, like the prior degrees, is infinite and uncreated in Him, while these degrees in angel and in man are finite and created. For the Divine which had filled all spaces without space, penetrated also to the ultimate things of nature. But before the assumption of the Human, the Divine influx into the natural degree was mediate through the angelic heavens, but after the assumption immediate from Himself. (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 233.)

Because the Divine-Human Body is infinite and uncreated it is visible only to thought (True Christian Religion, n. 339); and it can be presented even to spiritual eyes, as we have seen, only by the representative appearances of the spiritual world, in the sun of heaven or by filling an angel by aspect with its presence; and this is the very way in which it was made to appear before its incarnation on earth. Therefore, while it is proper for us to make the appearance of Him, to our thoughts by imagination, as much like the descriptions found in the Gospels as possible, we are to remember that it was through the Son of Mary that the Divine Human was then made to appear, as earlier in the Old Testament it was made to appear by an angel's presence, or as later in the book of Revelation, when John fell at the angel's feet to worship and was forbidden. The Divine-Human Body itself has never been, and never can be seen by finite powers, either of men or angels, for It is one with the Father — distinctly one; and to think of It in any other way is to

think according to the appearances of the letter of Divine Revelation, according to which God has often been thought of as in three persons. Hence we read: —

The Lord's Human, after it was glorified or made Divine, cannot be thought of as human, but only as the Divine Love in human form; and this more than the angels, who, when they appear, as they have been seen by me, are seen as forms of love and charity under the human shape, and this from the Lord; for the Lord, from Divine love made His Human Divine; just as man by heavenly love is made an angel after death, so that he appears, as just said, as a form of love and charity under the human shape. It is plain from this that by the Lord's Divine Human, in the celestial sense, is signified the Divine Love Itself, which is love toward the whole human race, in that It wishes to save them and to make them blessed and happy to eternity, and to make its Divine their own as far as they can receive it. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4735.[2])

H. C. H.

THE NEW THOUGHT.

We think ourselves and our readers very fortunate in securing a valuable contribution, which will be published in this and the July number of the Review, on the New Thought, I. Exposition, II. Criticism, by Horatio W. Dresser, Ph. D. Dr. Dresser is well known as the author of a number of interesting and widely read books representing the best features of this subject which is now commanding so much attention in the world. It is of especial importance to us, for while in many of its principles it is at variance with the teachings of our Church, it is believed to have come into existence by means of some suggestions found in the writings of Swedenborg. And no one is better qualified, we think, than Dr. Dresser, to tell us what the New Thought really is, and to point out its virtues and its errors and defects, and to give us just the information that we need. While he is not identified with us he is not unfriendly to our views; and his brother, the Rev. Jean Paul Dresser, of New York, is a valued member of our ministry. The present contribution has been given as two addresses at our Theological School in Cambridge, and at some other Theological Schools, and found very useful. We wish now to express our gratitude to our friend for permitting us to extend their usefulness to our readers.

H. C. H.

PRESENT TENDENCIES OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

THE tendencies of thought of any given period of history are very hard to detect. They are so interwoven with the motives of tradition and with the practical interests of the time, that they come to view, if at all, only in a long perspective and a wide survey. They are so complicated in the whole body of life, that they resist analysis and disentanglement ever more obstinately as the analysis attempts to go deeper and deeper.

What is true of tendencies of thought, and of historical periods in general, is emphatically true of the tendencies of the religious thought of the present day. There never was a time when human life, individual and social, was at once so complex, so various, and so tempestuous. International commerce and the world-wide extension of social and intellectual intercourse have brought the ends of the earth together in such a way that every most remote hamlet is more or less infected with cosmopolitanism. The conception of the universe as held by the average man has been transformed, so that human life is seen at a new angle, and the meaning of human history is brought before the bar of public opinion for a new adjudication. Even more perhaps, than by the all-pervading cosmopolitanism of the age, life is now influenced by the immense extension of modern science, especially in the fields of technical application and special investigation. Historical methods and methods of experimentation have gained such ascendency over the minds of men that every plane of human thought is dominated by their requirements. In a word, modern science has created a modern world-view which is so vast and so complicated as to be almost overwhelming in its impressiveness and in its powerful constraint upon the individual mind. The methods by which this view has been attained have so worked themselves into the life of the age that they are felt to be necessary and eternally valid laws of thought; and the view so constructed presents itself as the outgrowth of certain and exact knowledge.

In particular, cosmopolitanism and modern science combined have pervasively and imperatively affected religious thought in its

very depths. So much is this the case that the term "modernism" has been appropriated to designate the modern scientific spirit and method, especially as they are at work in the field of religious thought.

So it has come about that religious thought is interminably and inextricably interwoven in the complex tissue of modern life and modern science. When, therefore, we speak of the Present Tendencies of Religious Thought, we are to be understood as attempting to select and abstract certain characteristic features of the religious thought of the age, and to trace their significance in the total life of present day humanity.

In the light of these considerations it is not difficult to see that religion holds a well-defined place in the life of to-day, and that thought about religion is powerfully influenced, not merely in scientific circles, but also in all grades and classes of men, by the results of applying the historical method in comprehensive study of the religions of mankind at large, and the method of special investigation in the study of the religious experiences of individuals, especially those of the present day; in short, the results of two natural sciences, the history of religions and the psychology of religion. As the outcome of these sciences, there is general agreement that religion is an elementary, constant, natural constituent of human life, in which characterization the tendency is to emphasize the word 'natural' in such a way as to exclude the supernatural element in religious experience altogether.

In the view thus restricted, religion is evolved in the normal exercise and development of man's unaided faculties and powers, and has a natural history just as his other original endowments and acquirements, the intellectual, the moral, and the æsthetic, have. It is therefore, subject to rigorous historical and scientific treatment as a natural product. The result gives us what is called the "Science of Religion."

Here again, we must be on our guard to avoid too much simplification. On one hand we must recognize and bear in mind various tendencies and motives in carrying out this thought in detail. On the other hand, we must appreciate the fact that on the whole, it is a constant and characteristic tendency of modern thought thus to view religion as a purely natural product; and furthermore, that it leads strongly to the denial or neglect of any supernatural agency in its origin and development. Under the stress of this tendency the

Bible is to be considered just as much a purely historical product as any other body of so-called sacred literature, and is to be interpreted under the strict requirements of historical criticism and scientific method. Under these requirements its characteristic supernatural features are eliminated or explained away. In particular the pregnant phrase, "The Word of the Lord came unto me saying," is discredited; the virgin birth and the ascension are consigned to myth; and the Lord Himself is regarded as in the strictest sense a mere natural man, but with an unusual religious and moral endowment. The outcome of this tendency and dominating spirit is an arrogant and sweeping naturalism which rests ultimately on a mechanistic and materialistic view of the universe. The tendency is inevitable in any case, and is observable in every period of history and in all stages of human progress; but it is fortified in our day by the unprecedented development of the scientific spirit and method, and by the confidence in this method fostered by its astounding successes. The natural corrective is the sober reflection of thorough-going criticism and philosophy. Bacon's idea that a superficial study of nature leads away from God, but a deeper study leads back to Him, holds true of the situation to-day.

This glance at naturalism leads us to remark about another tendency which is now perhaps still more powerful and even more dangerous to genuine religion. It is the individualism of the age.

There is an obvious truth in the view that religion is in one sense a natural product, in that it is a variety of human experience; otherwise it would not be a proper human acquirement. But it cannot be consistently treated as merely a natural product; for however strictly we attempt to treat it as a natural product simply, we meet at the very threshold the fact that the constant and essential characteristic of religion is the idea of God, crude or perverted though it may in any given case be. To treat religion as a purely natural product, we must (as indeed many have done) attempt to show how the idea of God arose without God's coöperation; in fact, without presupposing the existence of God. The alternative is to show how it arose with His coöperation; in other words, how it was inspired and revealed. For the former view, the history of religion is a record of how man, by following his religious instinct, created God. For the latter, religion reveals the fact that God creates man. Open-eyed science, which takes in all the conditions and the whole nature of

an observed fact, recognizes the fundamental part which the idea of God plays in religion, and is not disposed to deny the existence of God, but rather to affirm it. But even such science none the less insists that religion as a variety of human experience has its natural history, and must, as any other subject of natural history, be studied, described, and explained according to historical and scientific methods. As a consequence, the science of religion defines its methods in terms of naturalistic presuppositions, and takes its place in the general body of the natural sciences, though with more or less hesitation and protest. The attitude of the scientific mind has worked its way subtly and pervasively into the thought of all classes of men, and has produced the most strongly fortified type of naturalism known to history; which, being also for the most part half conscious, is all the more insidious and influential. This naturalism combines with individualism with peculiar effect in religious thought about the nature of man and the precise nature of religious experience. The result is the view that man is through and through a product of nature, and human history is the process and record of natural development. This view takes little heed of the part which love and intelligence play in human life. It has little concern with man's freedom and rationality. On one hand his spiritual endowments are either ignored or treated as self-evolved manifestations of man's emotional and intellectual nature. On the other hand it emphasizes his dependence upon the causal conditions of the physical world, and his existence in that world as a mere animal.

It is the effort of all religious thought to conceive man in his dependence upon God. In fact religion consists essentially in the acknowledgment of this dependence and in a practical life flowing from it. Under the influence of individualism, however, even the best religious thought tends to emphasize so strongly the reality and originality of religious experience, that the dependence is lost sight of, and fails to be maintained. Religion, so it is asserted, to be real must be the individual's own free act of acknowledgment. It must be the act of his own will and understanding. So autonomous is this act for the naturalistic view, that it is conceived to be evolved inevitably out of the depths of man's nature, in so far as his inner nature is brought to complete development and expression; and this outcome is so natural that whether God exists and coöperates or not, makes little or no difference, — at least no appreciable dif-

ference. At this point naturalism and individualism combine in the view that man is an absolutely real and self-existent unit of life. Consequently, religion, the religion of individualism, is rather an acknowledgment of man's divinity, than of his dependence. In fact the alternative here presented gives rise to an ambiguity which haunts modern religious thought, especially perhaps in Protestant circles, — possibly not so much in Catholic, — like an ever-present evil demon.

Christianity as over against orientalism and antiquity generally tends to exaggerate the importance of the individual. Its peculiar mission to save the immortal soul, disposed it to set a unique value upon the person as the possessor of a soul. The elements of heathenism, which Christianity took up into itself mainly in the form of Greek science or tradition, had the effect of naturalizing and materializing the conception both of the soul and of the individual. The Catholic Church preserved the idea and the influence of the supernatural rather by external and ceremonial devices than by spiritual insight.

Protestantism, in its effort to break away from the Catholic Church, appropriated the individualistic motive, already passionately brought to the front in the humanism of the renaissance, and was more or less influenced by the naturalism which gathered new strength in the scientific awakening of the period. Over against the Church, as the intermediary of grace through its priest-hood and sacraments, Protestantism affirmed direct access to God by the individual through faith. In the act of faith grace was imparted, and through this act it flowed into the life with regenerative power. Here again the importance of the individual asserted itself. The faith must be the individual's own act, otherwise it would be something wholly external. The attempt to conceive faith as the operation of God in man was made, or was affirmed, as a religious requirement and as a dogma of Christian theology; but the individualistic conception of the nature of man, had the effect of making this affirmation merely an external form, while in fact and in thought all the emphasis was placed on the human side of the act.

The abstractions of the Kantian philosophy gave apparently a psychological and metaphysical basis for individualism; for Kant applied the traditional Aristotelian distinction between form and matter in such a way as to give man original creative functions in

the constitution of experience. German idealism, especially in romanticism, but also prominently in Fichte and Hegel, developed the philosophy of Egoism in such a radical form that the individual ego became in reality absolute, and the Absolute Ego a mere rational postulate or a metaphysical dogma. Under the influence of this philosophy and of modern science in general, Protestant religious thought, in spite of genuine efforts to keep true to religious requirements, has drifted more and more towards a naturalistic individualism, which in the end proves to be both anti-religious and anti-Christian. The modernistic movement in the Catholic Church shows that these influences are also at work there. As a matter of fact the body of modern Christianity is too complicated to fall under any narrow formulation; but if we regard Protestantism as the characteristic expression of free religious thought under modern conditions, we may see in it perhaps the best illustration of these two tendencies, naturalism and individualism, in Christian life, especially in Christian thought. The core and the stronghold of Protestantism as a phase of Christian thought is the *act of faith*. When we regard faith as the effect of Divine grace, we have, of course, a genuine religious fact, but one peculiarly liable to two dangers, both of which Protestantism exemplified. In the first place, there is the danger of taking faith, rather than the love out of which it springs, as the essence of religion. Faith so viewed is raised to a position of supreme importance, and, being an intellectual act, tends to become inordinately self-conscious, and to develop selfish characteristics, such as self-satisfaction, a sense of merit, self-exaltation, a feeling of superiority, and an intellectual pride, what Swedenborg aptly calls pride of self-derived intelligence. The act of faith is thus isolated and set apart and placed above all the other powers and functions of life as the peculiar seat and source of religion. In short, religion is here faith, and faith alone. Faith alone according to Swedenborg is the state in which Protestantism came to its spiritual death. It is a state of spiritual death because at this stage voluntary and rational connection with the Divine life is severed by the feeling of self-sufficiency and the act of self-assertion. The term grace and the notion of dependence become mere external forms which serve the purpose of self-justification and self-glorification. The self becomes the real man, and religion becomes merely one of the functions and products of the self.

This brings us in sight of the other danger. The act of faith, even though properly viewed as the effect of Divine grace, must nevertheless be the man's own act in which his freedom and rationality are expressed. Now, too much emphasis and insistence upon man's autonomy in this act leads to the relative neglect, and finally to the denial, of the Divine agency. This danger Protestantism was peculiarly liable to run into, because of its interest in affirming the individual character of the act of faith; and not having a clear conception of the spiritual nature of man, it inevitably fell a victim to naturalistic motives and influences. The effort to make the act of faith a genuine human achievement, found support in a naturalistic metaphysics. Man was conceived as an independent, self-existent unit of life; and even when his dependence upon God, as God's creature, was affirmed in dogma, or, when asserted in the figure of the Divine spark, his reality was secured only at the expense of his dependence, which tended in the end to become a relation between two self-existent beings. At this point individualism asserts itself. Not only must the act of faith be man's own, but man himself must be metaphysically real; he must be an autonomous, self-determining, self-existent personality. With this outcome, religion either disappears altogether, or it becomes a mere form of self-worship. The spark of divinity which man is then conceived to be, assumes the character and the proportions of a god. This is precisely the error and the result which Swedenborg points out in "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 3.

It would be unfair to say that Protestantism under the influence of naturalism and individualism has reduced itself to these two anti-religious positions. It is not meant to make this assertion, but only to call attention to the outcome of the tendencies here under consideration. There are, of course, other forces in the modern world; and above all the forces of the Lord's own Divine power operating directly upon it through the New Jerusalem. These forces are gradually bringing into existence a new Christianity.

L. F. H.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES.

THE LORD'S PRAYER:

Mr. Cabell's Suggestion Regarding Its Translation.

In a learned and interesting article in the "Study" department of the New-Church Review of April, 1910, page 290, our ever dear and departed brother, the Rev. Philip B. Cabell, advocated a return to the old form of words in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as [it is] in heaven," and he did this on the ground that the phrase "on earth" belongs adverbially to the imperative "be done," and should therefore according to English usage be placed next to it, so that the two form the natural antecedent to the relative adverb "as"; and on the further ground or reason that the English tongue "cannot with impunity separate the protasis of a comparison into two parts and put the apodosis between them." Mr. Cabell showed further that in rendering the Lord's Prayer into English the translator is often compelled to change the order of the words as they stand in the Greek original. For these reasons Mr. Cabell expressed his belief that it would be wise in the New Church to return to the old form, and thus into loving conformity with the rest of the Christian world.

In saying this our brother intended it to be understood that he did not restrict his argument to this special and particular clause of the Prayer, but that he applied it to the whole of it; for he asserts that all the changes introduced into it by our spiritual fathers in the Church several generations ago were a mistake, and that it would be wiser for us now to return to the form that is taken from the Authorized Version of Matthew's Gospel. He admits that the second Authorized Version commonly called the Revised Version is against him, but says he does not believe that its phrase "as in heaven so in earth" will ever become popular.

It is evident therefore that the impelling motive in the mind of our brother when making this suggestion was to have the New Church come into conformity with the rest of the Christian world. What he desired was that we should always say the Lord's Prayer as it has been said for centuries in English-speaking Christendom. Why so? To show our love for the Christian world by being like it in this respect. But it is evident that this motive, if we admit the force of it, will carry us very much further than this, for it must apply to the whole of the Bible, and not merely to the Lord's Prayer. On this ground therefore it would be a mistake to alter the King James Version in any way. It would be a mistake to change "Holy Ghost" into "Holy Spirit." In administering the Sacrament of Baptism we ought to say "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and thus come into loving conformity with the rest of the Christian world. Surely the Christian Sacraments are of equal importance with the Lord's Prayer. If during the administration of Baptism there should happen to be present in the church a visitor from some other Christian body, we ought to show our love for him by using the antiquated word "ghost." And so all through the Bible. If this rule is to be followed, we must cease to attempt any revision whatever of the text of Scripture, no matter how erroneous or antiquated it may be; for by so doing we are getting out of loving conformity with the rest of the Christian world. As a matter of fact however, the rest of the Christian world are by no means blind to the fact that the King James Version needs revision; and in many cases by trying to get into conformity with them we should really be getting out of conformity with them, if we followed the dictates of this sentimental feeling. We should in fact become one of the most reactionary and unscholarly sects on earth, that would excite the pity of every one whose ecclesiastical knowledge and forms of worship are up to date. I think it is clear therefore that this plea for loving conformity with the rest of the Christian world is not only the reverse of wise, but is also impossible of attainment, and this especially in view of the fact that the rest of the Christian world are by no means themselves in agreement together in respect to these matters.

Let us now examine the grammatical points of our dear friend's argument. Here it is quite evident that he starts from the old English form of words, and not from the Greek original. He assumes

that the old form is right, and then tries to prove that it is so. For how else could he say that the phrase "on earth" belongs adverbially to the imperative "be done"? and how else could he say that the two form the natural antecedent to the relative adverb "as"? The plain fact is that the King James translators here reconstructed the sentence. They did not merely translate it, but also tried to amend it; and Mr. Cabell adopts their work, and also their attitude toward the Greek original. In order to show this let us take a parallel case in something else. Let us suppose that in one of his messages the President of the United States used some such language as this: "May our country prosper, as in the past, so in the future." Here we have precisely such an imperative as occurs in the Lord's Prayer in the phrase "Thy will be done," which means "May Thy will be done." Now let us suppose that after reading the message, some editor of a Washington newspaper called on the President and said to him, "I want to change the order of a few words in your message to Congress; I want to make them read, 'May the country prosper in the future as it has done in the past.' The phrase 'in the future' belongs adverbially to the imperative 'May the country prosper,' and should therefore, according to English usage, be placed next to it, so that the two form the natural antecedent to the relative adverb 'as'." Would not the President reply, "My message as it stands is perfectly good English and needs no editorial tinkering on your part; I had a reason for placing the words in the order in which they stand in my message. Be so kind as to print in your newspaper precisely what I said, and take no liberties with it. Your grammatical reason is all moonshine." Well, is not this precisely so with the case in question also? Have not the King James translators here treated the Divine Author of the Lord's Prayer exactly as this supposed editor wanted to treat the President? Have they not edited the Prayer? Have they not reconstructed this sentence of it? Have they not tried to improve the phraseology of it? It is true that our friend bases his argument on the difference between the English idiom and that of the Greek language. But this does not help him, because if when writing His Prayer through the Evangelists the Lord had desired to construct this sentence as Mr. Cabell wants us to do, He could have done it in the Greek just as easily as the translators did it in the English. In the Greek the Lord could have put the phrase "on

earth" next to the imperative "be done," and before the word "as." But the fact remains that He did not do this; and therefore the irresistible inference is that He had a good reason for not so doing, and that we should be taking a most unwarrantable liberty with Him if we ventured to reconstruct this sentence as our friend pleads with us to do. The letter of the Word is holy, and must not be tampered with in any way or for any reason whatever.

But there is more to be said on this particular question. For while it is a fact that the King James translators did take this liberty when translating the Prayer in the Gospel of Matthew, it is also a fact that when they came to the Gospel of Luke they thought better of their conduct and repented of it; for in this Gospel they translated the words of this petition correctly. Turn to the second verse of the eleventh chapter of Luke, and there you will read, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth." Yet in the Greek there is no difference between the two Gospels; the sentence is exactly the same in both of them. And neither is there any difference here in the great manuscripts of the New Testament that have come down to us, except the change of one letter in the Greek word for "be done" in the Sinaitic codex, which does not change the meaning, and the omission of the "the" before "earth" in the same codex, which also does not affect it.

An additional reason for carefully preserving the order of the three clauses in the words, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so upon the earth," is that the first clause "Thy will be done," is the third of a series of similar petitions which in the Greek all run on in a manifestly connected order. These three petitions are, "Hallowed be Thy name," "Thy kingdom come," "Thy will be done"; there being a pause after each petition, as is plainly seen by the punctuation in the Greek. But in the case of the third petition this beautiful order and succession is violated and destroyed in the Old Church form of the Prayer, where in the last of these the words of the three clauses are all jumbled together in a man-made rigmarole. It may indeed be the fact that in reading aloud, this form of words can be more easily hurried through; but as in the New Church we are not in the habit of hurrying through the Lord's Prayer, we do not need this help to an irreverent utterance of it. We are quite willng to make a pause after the most impressive words "Thy will be done," before we add the equally impressive qualification, "as

in Heaven, so upon the earth." And upon consideration can any reasonable person doubt that this New-Church form is by far the better one in every way and on every account? Besides all this there is the very serious question whether the Lord did not intend the words "as in Heaven, so upon the earth" to apply to all three of the opening petitions of His Prayer. In the Greek New Testament there are no full stops here as we have them, but the Prayer reads, "Our Father who art in the Heavens, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done, as in Heaven, so upon the earth." And it is evident that the closing words might very well apply to all three of these Divine petitions. The works of Swedenborg throw no light on this point, I think, and we cannot dogmatize about it; but certainly this consideration forms an additional reason for preserving the New-Church form of these words now in question.

In his carefully written and thoughtful paper, Mr. Cabell has taken great pains to show that in translating Greek into English a translator is in many cases compelled to change the order of the words. This is undoubtedly the case. But in the case in question our friend goes far beyond this. As I have shown, he reconstructs the whole sentence, puts the cart before the horse, and turns the clauses backside foremost, which causes him to set "earth" before "heaven," and also in other respects to spoil the Prayer by taking unwarrantable liberties with it. It is true he did not originate this, but he adopted it, and has tried to make the whole of the New Church do the same. In translating the letter of the Word, no faithful translator will take so great a liberty with the original as is here advocated, for it is quite unnecessary, as I have shown. The New-Church form of the words is just as good English as any other that could be invented, and is also very emphatic.

We come now to our friend's additional reason for making the change he advocates, which is, that the English language cannot with impunity separate the protasis of a comparision into two parts and put the apodosis between them; but this argument need not detain us, for the fact is that there is no protasis here at all, seeing that a protasis is the first clause of a conditional sentence, and the sentence in question is not a conditional one. If the sentence had begun: "If thy will is done," it would then have been conditional, and this would have been the protasis; but as it stands, the sentence

is an ordinary compound sentence of three clauses, and consequently has no protasis, so that our friend's argument is here based on a mistaken and imaginary ground. And besides, even if this sentence were of the nature that our friend seems to have imagined it to be, it is perfectly clear that the apodosis would not have been what he alleges, but would also have included the words "as in Heaven," and this is precisely what we all are in the habit of doing when we say the Lord's Prayer; we do not separate the protasis of any comparison into two parts and put the apodosis between them, but we put the apodosis just where it belongs, namely, next to the protasis, which is exactly what our friend wants us to do.

Enough said. If I have succeeded in refuting the arguments of my dear brother Mr. Cabell on this question, I have done so with great regret and unwillingness, especially as he is not here to read what I have written. Mr. Cabell worked with me in making my new translation of the "Four Doctrines," being one of the critics who were appointed to go over my work and make suggestions; and I then formed a very high opinion of his attainments, and a very great admiration for his spirit of fairness and justice. The result is that I feel a deep affection for him; and I hope he is not distant from me while I am writing this reply, which I believe to be perfectly fair and just to him. But of course the truth must be told and maintained, at all hazards. The letter of the Divine Word is too sacred a thing to be vitiated in any way; and in my opinion Mr. Cabell has, with the best intentions, tried to lead us to do this, and to do it in a very serious and fatal manner, namely, in our daily use of the Lord's Prayer. It is not as if we had never formed the habit of saying this Prayer in what I have called the New-Church form. For more than a century we have accustomed ourselves to use this form; and what our friend has attempted is to lead us back to what is to us a long exploded and obsolete form of words. The Rev. Philip B. Cabell was most undoubtedly a sound and earnest New-Churchman, and had as much reverence for the letter of the Word as any of us; but he sometimes allowed his affections to bias his judgment, as we all do more or less, for a tendency to do this is a feature of the evil and false hereditary nature that we have received from our ancestors.

JOHN F. POTTS.

ON THE TRANSLATION OF JOHN iv, 24: "GOD IS A SPIRIT."

Is this the most intelligent rendering of the Greek *pneuma ho theos*? The main point of this question concerns the use of the indefinite article with the word "spirit"; that is, does the Greek present the idea of God as "spirit," or "*a* Spirit"?

The Greek has only the definite article, and when in that language a noun is presented without the article, it can be rendered in English in two ways, either with the indefinite "a" prefixed, or without it. For example, *pneuma*, which in our phrase stands alone, that is, without article, can be turned into English either as "a spirit" or simply as "spirit." Hence, as to the word *pneuma*, either "spirit" or "a spirit" is a correct translation.

These two expressions, however, bear quite different meanings in connected speech; so that "God is spirit" and "God is a Spirit" bring to the mind two quite distinct ideas. The difference in the ideas presented in the two statements has been perceived by the translators of the Authorized and the Revised Versions, although to an ordinary reader it is not very evident in the former, which renders the sentence, "God is a Spirit," — with a capital *S*. The Revised Version has precisely the same in the text; but it gives as a marginal reading, "God is spirit," — with a small *s*.

What the two versions have in the text is apparently due to a generally observed custom in translation, and was probably introduced from Luther's translation, which has the rendering *Gott ist ein Geist;* but the difference perceived is honestly put in the margin by the revisers. The discrimination of meaning in the two renderings has been voiced by Dean Alford in the "critical and exegetical commentary" to his "Greek Testament" (p. 660), where he says:—

> God being pure '**spirit**' (perhaps better not '*a* Spirit,' since it is His *Essence*, not His Personality, which is here spoken of), cannot dwell in particular spots or temples. . . .

I do not know of any commentary which defends the traditional translation. They all appear to agree that "God is spirit" is the proper version. That this is the sense, seems plainly evident from the context "they that worship him must worship him in spirit [surely not 'in *a* spirit'] and in truth." This would appear more forcibly,

if we allowed the fuller range of the Greek sentence to come to view.

In the sentence *pneuma ho theos* the predicate, *pneuma*, is made very emphatic by being given the foremost position in the sentence. "*Spirit*," Jesus declares, "is the God," so that He cannot be approached, as can the idols, in temples and shrines "in this mountain," or as "ye say . . . in Jerusalem;" "but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

The Greek expression, "*Spirit* is the God," would be weakened to insignificance, if the indefinite article were prefixed to "spirit" and the expression turned into "A Spirit is the God." He who is the God "in whom we live and move and have our being" (Acts xvii, 28), would be reduced to the level of a finite being. The juxtaposition of the two articles in English, — the weak, indefinite, with "Spirit," which is the emphatic word in the sentence, and the dignified, definite article with the important subject "the God," — are rhetorical contradictions which linguistic tact would avoid. Could we in English use as freely as the Greek, position of words in the sentence for the sake of emphasis, this would be clear in the sentence before us; but using mainly stress of voice, many niceties in the original are lost in translation. I say lost, because stress or accentuation of words is left to the individual reader, and often suppressed in places where it is clearly seen in the original; or the reverse may be the case. In order to save the original emphasis in the Greek sentence "*Spirit* is the God," we would, in a text book, resort to bold, black type, and print the sentence "God is **spirit**," which would at once awaken the antithesis in the Samaritan's mind, that, of of course, *spirit* is not confined to this or that place, but is accessible to the human, spiritual part anywhere, according to the state of the worshipper.

Of course Swedenborg's rendering "Spiritus Deus est" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9818, repeated in Doctrine of the Lord) affords no aid, inasmuch as the Latin is worse off as regards articles, because it has none at all. Still Swedenborg's explanation is helpful. He says: —

> By "spirit" is signified what is good and true inscribed on [man's] intellectual part, consequently the life of that part. That "spirit" when predicated of man has this signification is because man as to his interiors is spirit, and because as to his interiors he is together with spirits. . . .
>
> From this it may be known what is meant by "spirit" when applied to the

Lord, namely, Divine truth proceeding from His Divine good, and that this Divine, when it flows into man and is received by him, is a "spirit of truth," a "spirit of God," and a "holy spirit," for it flows in immediately from the Lord, and also mediately through angels and spirits. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9818[2,3]).

Swedenborg's rendering is helpful in so far as it defines to us what Dean Alford leaves merely a common expression, when he says that this verse "God is spirit" deals with His *Essence*, not with His Personality. What Alford calls the "Divine Essence" Swedenborg interprets as the "Divine truth proceeding from His Divine good," which in Swedenborg's terminology is of the Divine *Essence* (not His *Esse*), and hence expressive of Divine quality, which we express in English without an article; for example, "He is good," not "a good," and "He is spirit," not "a spirit."

Hence, in our version, if the stronger rendering "*Spirit* is the God" should be objected to as being a pedantic imitation of the Greek rather than good English, both forms of the article should be omitted from the word "spirit," leaving the translation "God is *Spirit*."

If there are some who regret that in this rendering the anthropomorphic idea is lost, — which is indeed the strong idea that the Lord by His coming emphasized, His purpose being to replace the idea of an "unknown" or "unknowable" God by the "known" and "approachable" God ("he that hath seen me hath seen the Father"), — then let us at least not lose sight of the situation. The childlike nature of man which needs the definite, the anthropomorphic, should never be lost sight of in the New Church: the childlike is the jewel with which her doctrines begin and end. But let me ask, Is the story of the Samaritan woman exactly the place where we should look for a lesson to teach children?

Jesus saith unto her, "Go, call thy husband and come hither." The woman answered and said, "I have no husband." Jesus said unto her, "Thou hast well said, I have no husband: for thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly."

This is no childhood's theme, and needs to be lifted up truly into the realm of spiritual quality, in order that the Husband of the church may appear first in His quality of the Bridegroom through the light of the claim,

"GOD IS SPIRIT."

J. E. Werren.

THE APPEARANCES OF THE LORD AFTER HIS RESURRECTION.

In taking up this subject of the Lord's appearances after His resurrection, I do not hope to throw any light upon it, but will seek to present the matter in such a manner as to raise questions which have been difficult for me to solve.

The question as to what became of the material body of the Lord is not one that I desire to dwell upon; for that has been settled by the statement in the writings of Swedenborg that it was dissipated (De Athanasii Symbolo, p. 35). There are, however, questions that grow out of and are connected with it, to which I will call attention.

First, — If the material human was dissipated, which must necessarily have taken place, for it was finite, and thus limited, what are we to understand by the Divine Human which the Lord put on? If, on the one hand, we say that the Divine natural substances took the place of the material human, does that not have the effect in our minds of leading us to think of the Lord in His Divine Human as so great or so small? And on the other hand, if we think of the Divine Human, as the term really implies we should, then we are obliged to try and conceive something the human mind is incapable of doing, namely, to form an idea of what is infinite.

Second, — We are taught that the disciples did not see the Lord after His resurrection with the eyes of the body, but with the eyes of the spirit (True Christian Religion, n. 777). If this be true, how are we to explain the fact that He showed Himself to Thomas and said: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust into my side"? (Heaven and Hell, n. 316). While it is not absolutely sure from this that He had the print of the nails and the wounded side, yet it would seem that He at least appeared to have them. And the fact that He ate "natural food" with the disciples, would seem to indicate that He had a body that could appropriate it. These things make it difficult to understand the nature of the Lord's glorified body.

Third, — The Lord after His resurrection appeared to the disciples when the doors were shut; which leads us to conclude that He was not limited by material substances. (Doctrine of the Lord, n. 35.)

And further, we read in MARK xvi, 12, "After that He appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country," — language which conveys the idea that the Lord appeared in different forms; in forms adapted to the needs of the different disciples, — the Greek word for "form" being *morphé*, which has the following meanings: 'form,' 'figure,' 'shape,' also 'fashion,' 'appearance.'

Lastly, I will quote the Lord's words when He appeared to the disciples, and they were affrighted: "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," concerning which language the writings of the Church so often remark that thereby is taught the fact that the Lord rose with His whole body, thus differently from man, who only rises as to the spirit.

These different things to which I have called attention make it evident that there are difficulties in trying to understand the nature of the Lord's glorified body; and I am sure that we all agree with one of the late eminent scholars of the New Church, that "the doctrine of the Lord's Divine Humanity, which includes that of His glorified body, is the corner-stone of the Christian Church." And he further says: "If this doctrine is properly understood, light is thrown upon all other doctrines; but if it is obscure and dark, or perverted in the minds of men, then all other points of doctrine are likewise obscured, or totally perverted." (Rev. R. L. Tafel.)

It might be well also in this connection to state that the resurrection of the Lord, is the doctrine in Christendom to-day which is being attacked more than any other except the Virgin birth, — the two questions, however, being really one, as the one involves the other; the resurrection being the culmination of the incarnation of the Divine.

In order to understand the appearances of the Lord after His resurrection, and thus the nature of His glorified body, it seems to be necessary to be governed in our thinking by certain fundamental principles. At least it seems a necessary order of procedure to elim-

inate such ideas as are not in accord with what we conceive to be rational, and to draw conclusions only from principles that are self-evident.

1. It is a fundamental principle that the Lord who was Jehovah was infinite, thus self-existent; life itself, love itself, wisdom itself, and having all power.

2. It is a fundamental principle that in assuming the human, the Lord came into a condition in which He was finite and thus appeared not only to angels but to the very eyes of men on earth.

3. It is a fundamental principle that the Lord could undergo no change which would add to the Divine nature, love, wisdom, and power; and therefore any teaching that indicates that something was added, should be interpreted in the light of this fundamental idea.

4. It is a fundamental principle that whenever angel in heaven, or man on earth, has a revelation of the Lord, it is an appearance; thus it is an adaptation of the Divine to the state of angel or man.

5. It is a fundamental teaching that the Lord put off the human assumed from the mother and put on the Divine Human from the "father" — which means that the Divine Human is Infinite.

6. It is a fundamental truth that the glorification of the Lord was the Divine appearing in the Human assumed, and not a change of matter into what is Divine.

7. It is a fundamental truth that the Lord is not to be thought of as dwelling in space; nor are we to think of Him as so great or so small; nor are we to think first of Him as a person, but to think of His Divine qualities first, and thence of person.

In the light of these fundamental principles I would raise the question whether we ought not to interpret the life of the Lord after His resurrection by laying greater stress upon the doctrine of representation and appearance than is usually done; and whether such a method of interpretation would not solve the difficulties that confront us in trying to understand the post-resurrection Gospel.

The doctrine of representation must be as true of the Lord after His resurrection as before it. If, as we are taught, He permitted the enemies to treat His body so as to represent the way they had treated the Word, it must also be true that He represented the Word by the manner in which He was received by the disciples after His resurrection. And if He appeared in different forms to the disciples after He rose from the dead, those appearances ought to be inter-

preted in the light of the doctrine that the Lord appears to each one according to his state. (Heaven and Hell, n. 118; Apocalypse Explained, n. 412[16].)

In the light of this doctrine of representation and appearance, let us notice briefly the significance of the Lord's acts after His resurrection.

In Matthew xxviii, after reading about the visit of the women to see the sepulchre, the earthquake, the decent of the angel from heaven, his rolling away the stone, and his comforting words to them (all of which represented the end of the old and the beginning of a new church, and also the new understanding of the Word), we are told that the Lord met the women as they were running to bring His disciples word, greeted them with the words, "All hail," and told them to tell His disciples they would see Him in Galilee.

That He appeared to the women first, teaches, as we well know, that the Lord's coming is first to the heart of man, and through that to the understanding; and that to meet Him and see Him in Galilee, means that He desires to dwell with us in the life of daily duties.

His meeting the eleven on the mountain in Galilee, as He had appointed, and giving them the commission, while an actual event, was done for the sake of its representation and significance; for every true apostleship is the result of going unto the mount where Jesus appoints us.

In Mark we have a few additional events recorded of the Lord's resurrection. One is His appearance in another form, already referred to; and another, which is more fully recorded in Luke, tells us that the Lord acted as a stranger with the two who went to Emmaus, — all of which is easily understood when we apply the law of interpretation, that the Lord appears unto each according to his needs and states. Still another event is His "appearing to the eleven at meat" as the Word has it, and upbraiding them for "their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen." (Mark xvi, 11.)

The record of Luke adds to the journey to Emmaus the fact that the Lord was known in the breaking of bread, the disciples' eyes being opened to know Him; also His ceasing to be seen of them. Here again we see the law of representation and appearance in operation; for first He acted as a stranger in order to represent that at first the Lord as the Word is not known as to real quality; but

after we invite the Lord to dwell with us and He breaks the bread of life to us, that is, gives the good in the truth, we learn to know Him, and learn that He has risen indeed. The second special event recorded in Luke is the act of eating the fish and honeycomb to convince the disciples that He was not a spirit, but that He had flesh and bones. We may well believe that the Lord did this to convince the disciples that He was not a spirit; but was it not also done for the purpose of representing a great truth with regard to the reciprocal union which He sustains to the regenerate man, and was not this truth made to appear in His saying, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have"? Did it not represent the fact that after the redemption He could be glorified in man on the plane represented by the "flesh and bones"? For the act of eating fish and honeycomb must have been significative, just as was the eating of bread and drinking wine at the institution of the sacred memorial.

I am aware that the writings of the Church speak of this act of eating, and of the statement that "a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have," as teaching that the Lord glorified His whole body. But in the light of the fundamental principles laid down, are we not to understand the act as representing the power of the Lord's resurrection on the plane meant by the "flesh and bones," rather than the formation of a body which is thought of as the Divine Humanity? I find it difficult to understand how there could have been formed a "body" called the "Divine Human" in the sense that it was a new creation — the creation of what did not previously exist.*

---

*"I have been told from heaven that in the Lord from eternity, Who is Jehovah, before the assumption of the Human in the world, there were the two prior degrees actually, and the third degree in potency, such as they are also with the angels; but that after the assumption of the Human in the world, He put on also the third degree, which is called the natural, and that thereby He became a man similar to man in the world, with the difference, however, that this degree, like the prior degrees, is infinite and uncreated in Him, while these degrees in angel and in man are finite and created. For the Divine which had filled all spaces without space, penetrated also to the ultimate things of nature. But before the assumption of the Human, the Divine influx into the natural degree was mediate through the angelic heavens, but after the assumption immediate from Himself." (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 233.)

"The glorification of the Lord is the glorification of His Human which He assumed in the world, and the glorified Human of the Lord is the Divine Natural." (True Christian Religion, n. 109.)

When we come to examine the resurrection record of John's Gospel, we find a larger number of events given, but we find no mention of "earthquake" and no "affrighted disciples." We find Mary weeping, and thinking the Lord the gardener, and recognizing Him as "Rabboni," when He speaks her name. What does this teach again but the truth that the Lord appeared to the disciples according to the state in which they were, in order to represent that this is the law of relationship between man and God? And when He said, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and my God and your God," what could be the significance of it, but that she represented the state of such as could not yet be fully conjoined to the Lord, because the truth, the means of conjunction, was lacking?

In John's Gospel we also have the scene of doubting Thomas and his being convinced by being told to "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust into my side." Unless this event is interpreted in the light of the doctrine that the Lord appeared unto the disciples in such a manner as to teach how he appears to different persons in different states of life, then we are forced to think (as is commonly done by those who dwell in the sense of the letter) that the Lord still has the scars in his body received by crucifixion and the spear. But does not Thomas represent the disciples at all times who must have something that appeals to the sense plane; and does not the fact that the Lord adapted Himself to his needs by revealing Himself as He did, teach that it was an appearance, and not the Lord in His Divine Humanity?

One more incident in John's Gospel which speaks of the representative character of the appearances and acts of the Lord after His resurrection, and I will conclude; and that is, His coming to the disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. The disciples had been fishing all night and had caught nothing. "But when the morning was now come," we read, "Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus." "Children have ye any meat?" He asks. "Cast your net on the right side of the ship and ye shall find," is the command.

What could this appearance of the Lord to the fishermen and His word of command mean, but that He was revealing Himself in

such a manner as to teach henceforth how we may become successful spiritual fishermen, whether we seek to reach men, or whether we seek to find the truth that will make us wise?

In conclusion let me again ask: have we not given the "Lord's glorified body," the "Divine Humanity," too limited an interpretation? Have we not materialized the Lord, as it were, by not remembering fundamental doctrines of the New Church?

L. G. LANDENBERGER.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

International Swedenborg Congress.*

No one who loves the New Church can fail to find great interest in this handsome volume; and every student of the works of Swedenborg, scientific, philosophical, or theological will desire to own a copy. For it not only contains a full account of the proceedings on this memorable occasion, including the social events, and excellent half-tone reproductions of photographs of groups, and of individuals who were prominent among the guests and speakers, and of the illustrations of several of the papers; but also the addresses and exceedingly valuable papers in full. They who were so fortunate as to be present and hear them will be glad to thus have the opportunity to study them carefully, while others will now be able to benefit equally in this study. Especially is this true of Section I, Science, to which several learned Professors of the University of Upsala and of Caroline Institute, and of the University of Vienna contributed. Such direct testimony to the value of Swedenborg's scientific works, and information from experts of their relation to the science of to-day, was never before, to our knowledge, gathered into one volume. The Philosophical and Theological Sections presented papers of perhaps even more value, — since spiritual things are more precious than natural, — but they are not so unusual. Taken together the three sections afford a complete presentation of the fields in which Swedenborg, under Divine Providence, worked so wonderfully.

The Preface states that the Congress consisted of about four hundred representatives from the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, India, France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, and Holland. His Majesty Gustaf V, King of Sweden, accepted the office of Patron of the Congress,

* *Transactions of the International Swedenborg Congress*, Held in Connection with the Celebration of the Swedenborg Society's Centenary, London, July 4 to 8, 1910. London: The Swedenborg Society. 1910. 385 pp., illustrated. 8vo. Cloth, $1.50, at the Book-Sales Rooms in this country.

and his Excellency Count Wrangel, Representative of the Swedish House of Nobles, that of Honorary President. The President was E. J. Broadfield, Esq., LL. D., and there was a long list of Vice-Presidents from various parts of the world.

Every address and paper in the volume is worthy of extended comment did space permit. But we must content ourselves with reference to a few striking points. The first address, by the President, is a delightful biographical tribute to Swedenborg. Prof. Lönnberg, Representative of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, of which Swedenborg was in his day one of its most active members, speaking of the reasons why Swedenborg's scientific writings were not more widely known and appreciated in the past, said that they were not really understood in his own day. We quote: —

> He was too far ahead of those times, and it has remained for our own days to do justice to his memory, as one of the greatest of Swedish investigators. Nevertheless there are indications that Swedenborg's works were circulated and noticed during his lifetime to a greater extent than is generally supposed. This is proved by the fact that his scientific works were dreaded and interdicted at Rome in 1739. It is also evident that many discoveries which have been attributed to authors such as Buffon, La Grange, Laplace, and several others, in reality had been anticipated by Swedenborg. It seems very strange, then, that so many of Swedenborg's works have for such a long time been committed to at least partial oblivion. The explanation of this may be correctly expressed by a French author, M. de Thomé (1785), who said, "Some people fear that the enlightening works of this, the greatest physicist and theosopher that ever was born, should give the death-stroke to their own systems. Others who have tacitly brorowed from him, tremble for the discovery if the source should become better known." (pp. 19, 20.)

The speaker went on to show how this injustice is now being corrected. Addresses followed by Professor Neuburger of Vienna University and Professor Ramström of Upsala, showing how remarkably Swedenborg anticipated modern knowledge of the spinal cord and the cerebral cortex as seats of psychical activity. Professor Tansley of the New-Church College, London, in a lucid paper set forth the Cosmology of Swedenborg. And Dr. David Goyder, showed with valuable illustrations, reproduced here, Swedenborg's teaching concerning the ductless glands, with modern confirmations; and Dr. Rabagliati did the same with his teaching concerning the motion of the brain.

Dr. Sewall of Washington was Chairman of the Philosophical

Section, and opened its session with an able address on the influence of Swedenborg upon Kant and modern philosophy. Herr Hjalmar Kylén discussed his influence on Swedish and German thought; Mr. Alfred H. Stroh showed his contributions to Psychology; Mr. J. Howard Spalding's subject was, The Spiritual World Non-Spatial Yet Organic; Professor Hite's, Ultimate Reality; and Influx and Degrees was presented by Mr. F. W. Richardson.

The Rev. William A. Presland, Principal of the New-Church College, London, and the Rev. S. S. Seward, President of our General Convention, were Chairmen of the Theological Section, and the Rev. Messrs. Smyth, Reed, and Hoeck, and the Hon. Job Barnard were the speakers from this country, together with a larger number of our English brethren. In a brief opening address Chairman Seward called attention to a remarkable fact as follows: —

> So far as I can remember this is the first occasion on which Science and Religion have met on equal terms on the same platform — the first meeting at which religious men have invited scientific men to coöperate with them in the work of upbuilding truth in the world — and at which scientific men have entered apparently without the least fear of any prejudice against them. . . . The two have come together under the leadership of that great man who was prepared to receive revelation from the Lord by his training in natural science, thus harmonizing the spheres of spiritual and natural knowledge so as to bring the two together as one. (p. 285.)

H. C. H.

New Biographies of Swedenborg.*

The appearance of four new biographies of Swedenborg within a period of six months might well incite an uninformed person to

* *Swedenborg: Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church.* By Benjamin Worcester. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1910. 294 pp. 12mo. Cloth. $1.25 net.

Swedenborg and the 'Sapientia Angelica.' By Frank Sewall, M.A., D.D. New York: Dodge Publishing Company. [1910.] 128 pp. 16mo. Cloth. 50 cents net.

Emanuel Swedenborg: Scientist, Philosopher, Seer, Revelator. By the Rev. W. H. Claxton. British Federation of N. C. Y. P. Societies. 1910. 63 pp., 14 illustrations. Oblong 32mo. Paper. 15 cents. (Reprinted from the *Young New Church Man.*)

An Illustrated Life of Swedenborg. By J. Stuart Bogg. London and New York: Frederick Warne & Co. 1911. 31 pp., 16 illustrations. Square 8vo. Paper. 5 cents. (Reprinted from the *New Church Young People's Magazine.*)

ask, "Why all this effort to call the attention of the world to this man? Why is a knowledge of his life important?" While each New-Churchman would give an answer to the latter question in his own way, we believe that most would agree to some such statement as the following: The final purpose in any good biography of Swedenborg is to lead to the study of his writings; because knowledge of the man gives assurance that he was neither an imposter nor insane; and acknowledgment of the sincerity of his claims with regard to his mission and his writings prompts in any truth-loving mind a desire to investigate those writings. For if the claims of Swedenborg are true, then it is evident that with the single exception of the Bible those writings are more important to humanity than any other literature, — nay, may we not say, than all other literature combined? An astounding thought, well inclined to lead to investigation.

If we ask concerning the value of a good biography of Swedenborg to one who is already numbered among his disciples, there are many answers, not the least important of which is that already given; for how many of us are so assured of the truths revealed through Swedenborg that we are not made more sure by learning how worthy of our confidence our great teacher is; how many of us so value his writings that their study could not well take more of the time we have available for reading? Moreover, every good biography attempts to explain concisely the essentials of the New-Church faith and principles, each restatement of which tends to impress more deeply the reader's understanding of such essentials.

When thirty years or so ago Benjamin Worcester undertook to write a life of Swedenborg, and aimed at scholarly completeness within the size of a single considerable volume, he produced his "Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg," still the standard life of our incomparable revelator. But having recently decided upon a more concise statement of the same message, he has now in his "Swedenborg: Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church" presented us with a volume based indeed on his earlier work, but containing scarcely more than one-third as much material. While this smaller volume naturally omits many details concerning its subject, we are of the opinion that partly on that account the impression of the greatness and sincerity of Swedenborg conveyed by it to the general reader of any spirituality will be clearer and deeper than by the earlier work.

The author has expressed his purpose in writing this volume in a brief prefatory note, as follows: —

> This small work, while it may serve as a brief but compendious biography of the man Swedenborg, has the higher purpose to show how at the culmination of the desolation of the Church of our Lord, foretold by Him, He Himself by the orderly enlightening of the mind of one of His servants has provided for the enlightening of the many as to His Divine purpose and presence in His Holy Word — whereby His face may now again be seen in the clouds of the misinterpreted letter.

This point of view naturally justifies the opening chapter of the book, entitled The Consummation of the Age, in which we are presented with a New-Church outline of the spiritual history of mankind up to the time of the Last Judgment, when according to our author there was needed new light to "explain the will of God and His providence for man in a rational, intelligible way . . . not with authority to compel, but with light leading into all truth, in accordance with our Lord's promise." It seems to us somewhat unfortunate, however, that a reader unacquainted with New-Church teachings is here at the outset presented with this to him strange phase of thought. Apart from this feature of the volume we have noticed nothing that we could not commend with unreserved heartiness. In our opinion it is probably the best volume of moderate size procurable for presenting a clear-cut and strong portrait of Swedenborg, drawn to show his spiritual development and how he was providentially prepared to perform his function as revelator. No New-Churchman can rise from reading the book without greater assurance that his faith in the New-Church teachings is well founded, and that in the writings of Swedenborg are priceless treasures, whose value few of us sufficiently appreciate.

The most interesting chapter of all is perhaps that dealing with the transition period in Swedenborg's life. In this chapter occur many quotations from that earlier spiritual diary commonly known as his "Dream-Book." Here we find the man undergoing temptations that give us by example a better understanding of what temptation really is. Strange to say, this is the work that one earnest New-Church scholar of a generation ago, the Rev. T. M. Gorman of Oxford, absurdly characterized as "a wicked forgery . . . fraudulently attributed to Swedenborg,"—a view not now held by any scholar, so far as we know, because the little book is too evidently a genuine account of remarkable personal experiences during regeneration.

We have spoken of the effect that a good biography of Swedenborg has in strengthening, in an outward way, our confidence in the teachings of the New Church; but we of course should recognize that we have not attained a real comprehension of those teachings until such extraneous evidence adds nothing to our assurance. Towards the close of his book, Mr. Worcester has expressed this thought admirably as follows: —

> Do we ask for a sign of the truth of Swedenborg's mission as the Divinely appointed interpreter of the Holy Scriptures, and as the harbinger of the new age of the Lord's Church, even that foreseen in vision by John as the Holy City descending from God out of heaven? The sign of this second coming of our Lord was to be the clear vision of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven — that is, in the clouds of obscurity through which men looked toward the Sun of heaven — clouds drawn from the ill-understood and misinterpreted letter of the Word. The proof of Swedenborg's mission will be found in the fulfilment of this sign — to each one in the clearer vision that by the interpretation of Swedenborg he now obtains of the Lord of heaven throughout His Holy Word. This sign no one can see for another, but every one must see for himself, and in very truth only by the aid of the Holy Spirit.

Turning now to the next most pretentious of the biographies before us, Dr. Frank Sewall's "Swedenborg and the 'Sapientia Angelica,'" we cannot but speak of the pleasure that the perusal of this little volume has afforded us. In the January issue of the REVIEW, writing with full recollection of our own vain search some years ago for a volume presenting in the language of modern philosophy an outline of Swedenborg's system of thought, we expressed our opinion that this little work was not such a one as would at that time have been of special interest to us; indeed, if such a world-needed volume anywhere exists, we do not know where to find it. However, in that notice we definitely stated that we did not mean to disparage this little volume as a biographical introduction to Swedenborg; for we fully recognized its excellence in this respect. No one acquainted with Dr. Sewall's previous writings and with his manifest interest in all matters relating to the life and teachings of Swedenborg, could for a moment doubt that, if he undertook to write a biographical sketch of Swedenborg, the volume would be a notable one. And such it proves to be. In fact we know of no biography of similar size that can compare with it in giving a concise view of the development of Swedenborg's intellectual interests, during which development he propounded as scientific and philosophic theories some of

those amazing principles that were later to become fundamental in his theological writings; nor do we know of any other forty pages that give so clear an outline of the essentials of Swedenborg's system as is contained in chapters six and seven of this work. We cannot but wish that these two chapters might be published separately, so as to stand unencumbered by the biographical setting. As an admirable summary, they are worthy of study by every New-Churchman; and we believe they would make an excellent missionary pamphlet to use in arousing the interest of thoughtful readers.

As to the two illustrated pamphlets that have recently come to us from our English brethren across the water, we have first to note that both are reprints from magazines intended primarily for the young people of our Church, Rev. Mr. Claxton's "Emanuel Swedenborg: Scientist, Philosopher, Seer, Revelator" having first appeared in successive issues of the *Young New Church Man*, a periodical with similar purpose to our *New-Church League Journal;* while Mr. Bogg's "Illustrated Life of Swedenborg" is from the same type from which it was originally printed in the organ of the New Church Sunday School Union known as the *New Church Young People's Magazine*. Excellent as these two sketches are, in neither of them do we find anything that is especially worthy of comment. While Mr. Claxton's booklet has perhaps a richer outward appearance, and while it contains a third more reading matter than that of Mr. Bogg, we incline to think the latter more interesting, and therefore better suited to missionary work. It contains more information, presented in a more popularly attractive way, embellished with larger and more numerous illustrations, and the whole well suited to arouse interest in any reader. We are much pleased that the noted publishing house of Frederick Warne & Company was induced to publish it; and we are informed that it is finding its way all over the world, and meeting with a very happy reception. May the Lord speed the mission of all such efforts.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

Correspondences of Canaan.*

The land of Canaan or Palestine holds a unique position among the countries of the earth, as the home of the Most Ancient Church, of the Ancient Church, of the Jewish Church, and the cradle of the Christian Church, and the land in which the Lord lived His Divine life with men. And not only this, but the land both as to its natural features and its inhabitants enters largely into the Scriptures as a part of the great parable of life. There is a peculiar charm and interest about a land which has been appointed to this use. There is need for the amazing variety of scenery, of soil and climate and productions, which is compressed into this small area, and for the various tribes and nations which have occupied it, and with the land have become a part of the Word.

A glimpse of the interest attaching to the land of Canaan is given in the little book before us. The map has been carefully studied, and good authorities are cited in relation to geography and inhabitants, and the writings of Swedenborg are largely quoted to show the spiritual significance of the physical features of the land and the tribes and nations who are identified with it. It is valuable to draw upon the best scientific knowledge as a basis for the spiritual lessons; and it is surprising, when they are brought together, to find how many valuable statements of literal fact are made incidentally by Swedenborg in connection with his spiritual exposition.

The little book shows careful study, and should encourage further study of the wonderful land of the Bible. There is still opportunity for one who will live long enough amid the scenes and sacred associations of the land, to give us a fuller sense of its beauties and its charms, which will deepen our interest, and give us a clearer perception of the spiritual meaning of the land and of every detail of the land which enters into the letter of the Word.

Wm. L. Worcester.

* *Correspondences of Canaan: a study of the spiritual geography and history of the land and nations of the Word.* By Carl Theophilus Odhner. Academy Book Room, Bryn Athyn, Pa. 1911. 160 pages. 8vo. Cloth. 75 cents.

Reason and Belief.*

This work, whose title and authorship will at once attract wide attention, is dedicated to the Rt. Honorable Arthur James Balfour, Past President of the British Association and also of the Society for Psychical Research. In view of the author's calling as a man of science the book may prove a disappointment in one way, while it will be as agreeable a surprise in another. The author's devotion to physical science has at least not dried up the fount of inspiration in his soul, nor cooled entirely, as was said of Darwin, his love for poetry and the beautiful and ideal in general. The disappointment in fact will be in finding that the author's reason and belief are the reason drawn from imaginative and emotional sources rather than from any strictly scientific demonstration, and the belief founded on this quite human basis rather than on the dogma of revealed religion itself. His affirmative attitude toward the revealed dogmas is pleasing to feel and all the corroboration drawn from the witnesses of literature make enjoyable reading; but withal, there may be felt that the ultimate reason itself is not reached and that perhaps the truer title of the book would have been Imagination and Belief. For it is clear that belief must rest at last upon dogma — the established fundamental certainty, whether this be religious or scientific, whether, indeed, it be actually true or not. If it is true to the believer it is true as real, abiding, eternal certainty, and not as something agreeable for the time but awaiting a probable modification, if not removal, in the near future. Science has its dogma of the final sort as truly as religion; but it is not quite clear whether Sir Oliver Lodge's "Belief" has it or not. Even if he seemingly accepts Incarnation as a reality he does not attempt to give the reasons why Incarnation must be true; and if he seems to accept Revelation as affording pleasant themes in which the reason and imagination may exercise their powers, he does not undertake to show why and how Revelation itself is necessary, in the very nature of things, as a condition and accompaniment of an existent universe.

The preface of the book alludes to the question as to the use to

* *Reason and Belief.* By Sir Oliver Lodge. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1910. 226 pp. 12mo. Cloth.

be made with children of the stories both of the Old and the New Testament, and the thought developes into the discussions of the book itself in the three divisions:

Part I. Incarnation in general leading to the incarnation of Christ.

Part II. The Old and the New Evolution.

Part III. Apologies and reply to critics.

The sketch we give is designed to illustrate the spirit that animates the book and to suggest, though poorly, the intellectual and literary charm which characterizes it throughout and which can only be marred by any attempt at condensation.

In discussing the various aspects of truth the author remarks of the Old Testament that the great parts of it are "manifestly" inspired — without telling us wherein this manifestness lies or what inspiration is. Inspiration, he says, is a "reality" though its definition is at present vague. "Whatever it is it does not mean infallibility." "No information concerning matter of fact is indeed infallible. Our knowledge, even as expressed by the highest science, is necessarily partial and incomplete; it only deals with aspects; else it could not deal with things at all."

The New-Churchman will be interested in comparing this with Swedenborg's statement as to the source of our knowing in the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3368: —

> The things of reason illustrated by the divine are appearances of divine truth. All appearances of truth in which is the divine are of the rational faculty, insomuch that rational truths and appearances of truth are the same, whereas scientific things belong to the natural plane.
>
> Rational truths can never exist and come forth except from an inflowing of the divine into the rational faculty of man, and through the things of reason into the scientific things which belong to the natural plane of the mind. The things that then take place in the rational appear in the natural plane as an image of many things together in a mirror.

"Reality," says Sir Oliver, "must in its fullness include not things alone, but Humanity and Divinity too. Every thing has a human aspect and every thing has a divine aspect." The Hebrew literature is an attempt to present things from this point of view.

The problem of evil is brought down to its origin in the relativity of existence. The scope of science must include the vast realm of the as yet undiscovered and the illimitable possible advance of science.

> The sources of inspiration and of thought may be among those subjects which

science itself may yet be called upon to investigate. . . . In mystery the soul abides. Yet it behooves the scientific man to try to comprehend whence the inspiration comes and to formulate, if he can, the laws of its being.

In treating of the "adventure of existence" and birth, the author says that personality begins but not from nothing, and it is immortal. A planet represents a present phase of existence. There is a cycle of changes but neither a beginning nor an end of reality. The human race had a beginning but "the death of the body conveys no assurance of the soul's decease." "The body has been formed to a given pattern quickly enough, but there must be some entity, even though only a germinal vessel, which collects and arranges the particles to suit itself." "The proper form of the structure depends on this entity, not on the miscellaneous sources of the particles." Individuality, once begun, shall not therefore completely cease. Character is all that we take with us; life here gives us this character which is our permanent possession. "There is some truth," the author says, "in pre-existence but the permanent individual begins at birth." Science says that man must trace his ancestry through animals which are thus his remote kindred. "A long process was necessary before the improving body could be made tenantable by anything that could be called a human soul." The beautiful animal body, slowly fitted for our reception, we utilize for its purposes here. The same body discarded looks dead and dismal enough, but this is only because the energizing spirit, which constructed it, has gone beyond our ken.

The author here possibly involves himself in a contradiction, in that he has spoken of the animal body as fitting itself, or being fitted, for the reception of the spirit, and yet of the spirit as having constructed it. Swedenborg's doctrine of man and the human soul as being not life itself but a receptacle of life, and entering the germ prepared under Divine auspices by whatever evolutionary process, and so shaping its future body, both the substantial, spiritual body and the transient material body, for its uses in the two successive planes of existence, would perhaps straighten out this difficulty in the author's presentation.

The illimitable advance of science, even into realms hitherto altogether untouched, seems to inspire much of our author's discussion. Thus he says that those who devote themselves to study think that they are coming slowly and partially to understand the universe and our place in it, and what is expected of us. These are the

questions that thoughtful people are asking at the present time. Why do we exist? What are we here for? What does existence mean? The only service that has the promise of eternity is that which is free, the response of the whole being to the demands of the highest which it is able to conceive. The idea of angels is not altogether fanciful. Angels have descended in the poets: —

A Divine Helper has actually taken flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth. We are all sons of God in a sense; but at that epoch (*Anno Domini*) a Son of God in the supremest sense took pity on the race, laid aside His majesty, made Himself of no reputation, took upon Himself the form of a servant, a minister, entered into our flesh and lived on our planet as a peasant, a teacher, a reformer, a martyr. As a student of science I am bound to say that so far as we can understand such an assertion there is nothing in it contrary to accepted knowledge. Christ did not spring into existence as the man Jesus. The Christ spirit existed through all eternity: at birth he became incarnate — the Son of Man. Before, the Word of God, the Idea, the Design, the Conception embodied became a physical reality. "In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was God, and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us"; that is as near as we can get to the extraordinary truth. The great Spirit took pity on the human race and came to tell us of the kingdom of heaven. The vision has been the hope of millions, the inspiration of saints and of apostles.

In all this seeming doctrine of a Divine incarnation as a means of the redemption of the human race it will be seen that there is really no element of a redemption by any superhuman act, or the furnishing of a superhuman aid to man other than that of an exalted idealism. The doctrine does not reach beyond the Unitarian conception of a redemption by example. There is no mention of hells to be conquered, of devils to be cast out, of a mighty arm when pitying Love "looked and there was no man"; no mention of the terrible conflict in One soul for the liberation of all souls, of the cry upon the cross "It is finished," and of the word of hope for all generations to come, "Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world!"

We would not diminish in the least the hopeful significance of this affirmative attitude of a man of science toward the revelations and the working of the Spirit. But neither can we see the lever of a real uplift of humanity in that which is only resolvable into the human, even into its highest ideals. But we will not yield to him in his cheerful optimism, in his broad, charitable, hopeful outlook for the future. He says: —

Our spiritual eyes are still closed even now. . . . But reformers and dram-

atists are busy. People are waking up. There is hope in the air. Even now the seers and the poets are preparing their songs to welcome a Second Advent of the Divine Spirit in the hearts of men; — not in Palestine, nor in Asia Minor, but here in Europe, in Britain, in London. The time will surely come when we can feel that the fullest dream of the poet, has been fulfilled:

> . . . "And lo! Christ walketh on the water,
> Not of Gennesareth, but Thames."
>
> (Francis Thompson.)

. . . The conclusion I have arrived at is that future events are planned. Arrangement is possible in other spheres than ours. Foresight and anticipations and heraldings far above our present power but of the same general character are possible. So Christ's posthumous utterances at the end of Luke's Gospel may be essentially true, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself," even as before he had declared in the presence of the Jews, "Before Abraham was, I am!"

It may not occur to the reader, nor even have occurred to the author, that these signal Scriptural confirmations of the Deity of Jesus are really here resolved into a process of purely human telepathy, or mind reading, "far above our present power but of the same general character."

We are certainly in hearty accord with the author's noble definition that,

the uplifting of the spirit of man is the highest claim that can be made for any study, any action, any emotion; while the fact that it achieves such uplifting is its highest tribute, its highest justification.

And these means for human uplifting are not, it is claimed, exclusively in the lines of scientific discovery: —

For others, though not for the scientific students themselves, channels of Divine Grace may be dependent upon refined feeling rather than upon recondite knowledge, —

> O fret not after knowledge. I have none.
> And yet my song comes native with the warmth.
> Oh, fret not after knowledge, I have none!
> And yet the evening listens.
>
> (Keats — Posthumous Fragments.)

FRANK SEWALL.*

* Author of "Reason in Belief: or Faith for an Age of Science: an examination into the rational and philosophic contents of the Christian faith." London: Elliot Stock. 1906.

The Cheapening of Religion.*

This is a reprint of an article which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for last October. It is a striking presentation of the modern tendency of the Christian Church to bolster up its influence with the people by methods other than spiritual. It goes back to the time when the word 'religion' meant strictly the conscious relation between man and God, and the expression of it in conduct. But we understand that the second part of this definition did not apply to the theology of the Church in the past, when salvation by *faith alone* was taught; it rather applies to the New-Christian Church. And the chief value of this little publication perhaps is in the testimony it bears to the great change that is being wrought by the Lord in His second coming, which is filling the denominations and the great world of working people with a longing for a religion that shall be both spiritual and at the same time vital to the experiences of everyday life. The real trouble, which leads to this cheapening of religion by the various denominations, is the lack of any definite knowledge of, and therefore belief in, the spiritual world; the possession of which is the great treasure of the New Church.

H. C. H.

Socialism and Individualism.†

If one wishes to have the very latest information on the subject of industrial reform, we know of no other books that will serve his purpose so well as these. Indeed we think them admirable. Mr. Kelly in his "Twentieth Century Socialism" has given us the best thought on that side of the matter, and it is freed from the objections which could be found abundantly in the theories of the Marxian

* *The Cheapening of Religion.* By James O. Fagan. New York: New-Church Board of Publication. 1911. 52 pp. 12mo. Cloth. 25 cents net.

† *Twentieth Century Socialism: What it is not; What it is; How it may come.* By Edmond Kelly, M.A., F.G.S., Late Lecturer on Municipal Government at Columbia University. New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1910. 465 pp. 12mo. Cloth. $1.75 net. By mail $1.88.

†*The Old Order Changeth; A View of American Democracy.* By William Allen White. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1910. 266 pp. 12mo. Cloth. $1.25 net.

Socialists of the last century. And Mr. White, while he no less severely condemns the evils of present and past Capitalism, still holds firmly to the principles of individualism as the sound and sane basis for civic righteousness and industrial progress. Nevertheless, as indicated by the title of his book, "The Old Order Changeth," he believes that individualism is rapidly passing into new forms in which the people will govern for the common good as never before. But the private ownership of capital need not be changed, if politics are purified and made effectively democratic.

Mr. Kelly's first task is to remove prejudices from the minds of his readers. This he does by discussing in a full and able fashion what Socialism is not, that it is not Anarchism, nor Communism, nor will it suppress competition, or injure the home, or abolish property, or impair liberty; indeed, as he goes on to demonstrate, it is believed that it will set men free as never before they have been, and remove poverty by making property secure to its rightful owners. The only property that he would socialize is that engaged in production and public utilities which has been already socialized by the introduction of machinery and great coöperative enterprises. As evils of Capitalism he discusses overproduction (which is more truly perhaps underconsumption), unemployment, prostitution, adulteration, waste, and the struggles between capital and labor. He holds that these evils are incidental and unavoidable under the present industrial system, and that the only way of reform is by a change to the socialistic system, which must begin by the transfer of political power from the few who exploit it for their own individual benefit, to the many who will utilize it for the benefit of all; and it must continue by a similar transfer of industrial power from the few who use it for their own selfish and individual benefit to the many who will use it for the common good; and since industrial power goes with the ownership of the machinery of production, that ownership must gradually pass to the many. This could be accomplished by the transfer of ownership, by purchase, to the commonwealth; while the management could remain in the hands that had proved efficient in the past.

Mr. White in his book, "The Old Order Changeth," stops short of the last step, as to ownership. He sees no need of a transfer of industrial properties, nor even of railroads; for if political power passes to the people, the use of capital can be controlled by legisla-

tion for the common good, as has already begun to take place under the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of Munn *vs.* Illinois. We read: —

> The court holds that "When the owner of a property devotes it to a use in which the public has an interest, he in effect grants to the public an interest in such use; and must to the extent of that interest submit to be controlled by the public for the common good, so long as he maintains the use." (pp. 68, 69.)

It is shown how under this precedent the Interstate Commerce Commission has been able to restrain the railroads equitably for the common good; and in many states anti-trust laws are operating to the same end with growing success. The writer traces in a most interesting way the struggle of the people against ignorance and private and corporate greed, which is to culminate in the dethronement of the political boss by means of direct primaries and the secret ballot, together with the cutting off of the sources of his supplies in the saloons and other forms of organized vice; and by the municipalization of public utilities — light, water, heat, power, transportation — which now help to support him for the sake of franchises. It is shown unmistakably that great tides of reform are now constantly sweeping over the nation with bright promise for the future. We read: —

> The reform movement is a deep tendency of our life; it is our mysterious link with the infinite body of humanity — the body in which, by some strange spiritual alchemy, the good of one is the good of all. . . . But whatever this conscience of democracy is, it is binding us into a closer national union than we have known before, making us one blood in our common aspiration. And thus a race is renewing itself. (pp. 167, 168.)

H. C. H.

STANDARD NEW-CHURCH BOOKS.

The Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg. With Portrait. Benjamin Worcester	$2.00
Swedenborg and the New Church. James Reed	50 cents
Lectures on the New Dispensation. Benjamin F. Barrett	60 cents
The Divine Word Opened. Jonathan Bayley	1.00
Emanuel Swedenborg; his Life, Teachings, and Influence. George Trobridge. Paper	25 cents
Discrete Degrees in Successive and Simultaneous Order. Nathan C. Burnham. Illustrated by Diagrams.	4.00
Dictionary of Correspondences	1.25
General Index to Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations. Arthur Hodson Searle	3.00
The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being. Chauncey Giles	50 cents
Foundation Truths of the Christian Religion; passages selected from Swedenborg	50 cents
The Science of Correspondences Elucidated. Edward Madeley	1.50
Swedenborg's Doctrine of Correspondence. Lewis P. Mercer	75 cents
An Appeal in Behalf of the Views Held by the New Church. Samuel Noble	75 cents
Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. Theophilus Parsons	50 cents
The Professor's Letters; with Portrait of the Author. Theophilus Parsons	60 cents
Paper boards	30 cents
The Holy Word in its own Defence. Abiel Silver	75 cents
The Swedenborg Concordance. 6 vols. Cloth	24.00
Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Church. Rudolph L. Tafel	1.75
Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg; original and translated. Rev. James Hyde	10.00
Compendium of the Theological Writings of Swedenborg. Samuel M. Warren	1.50
Correspondences of the Bible: Animals. John Worcester	1.00
" " " **Plants, etc.** " "	1.00
Physiological Correspondences. John Worcester	1.00
Spiritual Interpretation of the Scriptures. John Worcester	
Genesis and Exodus.	75 cents
Matthew's Gospel.	50 cents

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

No. 16 ARLINGTON STREET, BOSTON

TRANSACTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SWEDENBORG CONGRESS

July 4 to 8, 1910

Containing all the papers read on
Science, Philosophy, and Theology,
and an account of the proceedings.

388 pages, 64 illustrations. Cloth, $1.50 postpaid.

ORDER FROM MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION,
16 Arlington Street, Boston, Mass.

COMMENTARY on the PSALMS

Compiled from the Theological Works of Emanuel Swedenborg
By the Rev. ROBERT S. FISCHER

520 pages 12mo. Blue cloth $1.25

The compiler has aimed to bring together everything that Swedenborg wrote in explanation of the Psalms.

OBSERVATIONS on the GROWTH of the MIND

By SAMPSON REED
New Edition, with a Biographical Preface by James Reed

99 pages 16mo. Paper cover 35 cents

A reprint of the last American edition of this New-Church favorite

Published by MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION, 16 Arlington Street Boston, Mass.